SHOUT
SHARE
IT
WAKE

HISTORY OF THE FREEDOM MOVEMENT IN INDIA

VOL. II

HISTORY OF THE FREEDOM MOVEMENT IN INDIA

VOLUME II

By

R. C. MAJUMDAR, M.A., Ph. D., D. LITT. (Hon.)
Vice-President, International Commission for a History or the Scientific and Cultural Development of Mankind (UNESCO); Honorary Fellow of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland; Honorary Fellow of the Asiatic Society of Bombay; Honorary Fellow of the Asiatic Society of Calcutta; Formerly

Vice-Chancellor of the University of Dacca; Principal, College of Indology, Hindu University, Varanasi; Director, Board of Editors for the History of the Freedom Movement in India; Professor, College of Indology, Nagpur University; Visiting Professor of Indian History in the Universities of Chicago and Pennsylvania (U. S. A.).

Firma K L M Pvt. Ltd.
Calcutta 1988

Published by Firma K. L. M. Pvt. Ltd.
257B, B. B. Ganguly Street, Calcutta 12, India.

First Published in 1963
Revised Edition 1975
Reprint 1988

© R. C. Majumdar.

Rs. [redacted]

Printed in India
by R. Mitra at United Printers
60/1A Mahendra Banerjee Road
Calcutta-60

DEDICATED
TO THE MEMORY OF THOSE
WHO LIVED AND DIED
FOR
THE FREEDOM OF INDIA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abbreviations	xii
Preface to the First Edition	xiii
Preface to the Second Edition	xxiii

Book III

THE ERA OF NATIONALISM

Chapter I: THE PARTITION OF BENGAL

1. History of the Partition	3
2. Agitation against Partition	6
3. Reaction to the Partition	10

Chapter: II. THE SWADESHI MOVEMENT

I. General Review	33
II. The Economic Boycott and Swadeshi	
1. The Supply	37
2. The Method	40
III. The Effect of Boycott	53
IV. National Education	
1. Repressive Measures against Students	60
2. National Council of Education	69
V. Spread of Swadeshi Movement Outside Bengal	81
VI. Reign of Terror	85
VII. Hindu-Muslim Riots	102
VIII. Wider Aspects of Boycott and Swadeshi Movement	
A. Boycott	114
B. Swadeshi	117

C. The National Movement 126
D. Nationalist Literature 129
IX. Split between the Moderates and the Extremists 138
X. The Spirit of Militant Nationalism 143
XI. Some Special Features of the Swadeshi Movement 156

Chapter. III. SPLIT IN THE CONGRESS

I. The Moderates and the Extremists
A. Difference in Theory 165
B. Difference in Action 186
II. The Calcutta Session, 1906 190
III. The Surat Session, 1907 196
IV. Influence of the British Government upon the Moderates 203
V. Repercussions of the Surat Congress 206

Chapter IV: MUSLIM POLITICS

I. Muslim Attitude towards Partition of Bengal 210
II. Muslim Deputation to Lord Minto 211
III. Foundation of the Muslim League 219
IV. Hindu-Muslim Relations 223
V. Communal Riots 235

Chapter V. BRITISH POLITICS

I. Policy of Repression 238
II. Reforms 244

Chapter VI. MILITANT NATIONALISM

1. Early Revolutionary Activities in Bengal
1. The Influence of Swadeshi Movement 250

2. The Cult of the Bomb 253
3. Anusilan Samiti 261
4. Dacca Anusilan Samiti
A. Initiation into Membership 265
B. Organization 267
C. Activities 269
i. Collection of Arms 269
ii. Murder of Officials and Spies 270
iii. Dacoities 273
II. Early Revolutionary Activities Outside Bengal 282
A. Bihar and Orissa 283
B. The Panjab 287
C. Maharashtra 289
D. Other Regions 294
1. Rajasthan 294
2. Banaras 296
3. Madras 296
III. Early Revolutionary Activities Outside India 297

Chapter VII. HOME RULE MOVEMENT

I. The Different Political Parties (1907—1914) 309
II. The First World War (1914—1918)
1. The Events leading to the War 314
2. The Main Incidents of the War
i. The Year 1914 317
ii. The Year 1915 318
iii. The Year 1916 319
iv. The Year 1917 319
v. The Year 1918 321
3. India's Contribution to the War 323
III. Reaction of the Indians to tne World War I. 326
IV. Home Rule Movement
1. The Genesis 330
2. Re-entry of the Extremists to the Congress 331
3. Mrs. Annie Besant 336
4. Bal Gangadhar Tilak 339

5. Joint Efforts of Tilak and Besant 343
6. Repercussion of Home Rule Movement Outside India 353
7. General Review 356

Chapter VIII. REVOLUTIONARY ACTIVITIES

I. Indian Revolutionaries Abroad 363
II. The Ghadar Movement
A. The Genesis 365
B. The Formation of the Ghadar Party 367
C. The Activities 371
D. Nature of Propaganda by the Ghadar Party 374
III. Other Revolutionary Activities Outside India During the First World War
A. Germany 377
1. General Plan 377
2. Indian Independence Committee in Berlin 379
B. I. Indo-German Activity in U. S. A. 387
Cutting from the New York Times 396
C. Revolutionary Activities in Britain and France 401
D. Revolutionary Activities in Indo-China 402
1. Mutiny at Singapore 402
2. Revolutionary Activities in Siam 404
E. Indo-German Mission in Afghanisthan 405
IV. Revolutionary Activities in India During the First World War
A. Bengal 408
B. The Panjab
1. Muslim Conspiracy 415
2. Activities of the Revolutionarlies Returning from America 417
C. The General Rising 423
V. Komagata Maru 429
VI. General Review 434

Chapter IX. REPRESSION AND REFORMS

I. Repressive Measures 459
II. Grant of Reforms
1. The Critical Situation 463
2. Montagu's Historic Declaration 464
3. The British Policy Towards India 466
4. Reaction to Montagu's Declaration 472
5. Montagu-Chelmsford Report 475
6. Reaction to the Montagu-Chelmsford Report 478
7. Special Session of the Congress at Bombay 482
8. The Congress Session at Delhi 488
9. Tilak and Home Rule League 490

Index 498

ABBREVIATIONS

The following abbreviations have been used in the Footnotes :—

CHI	*The Cambridge History of India.*
IAR	*The Indian Annual Register.*
MR	The *Modern Review.*
Muslim League	Lal Bahadur, *The Muslim League.*
Nation	Surendranath Banerjea, *A Nation in Making.*
Savarkar	Dhananjay Keer, *Savarkar and His Times.*

The following books have been referred to by the title of their authors :—

Bagal, J. C.	History of the Indian Association.
Buchan, J.	Life of Lord Minto.
Datta, Bhupendra Nath	Aprakasita Rajnitik Itihasa (in Bengali), 2 Vols.
Fuller, Bamfylde	Some Personal Experiences.
Griffiths, Sir Percival	The British Impact on India.
Guha, N. K.	Banglay Viplabvad (in Bengali).
Hardinge, Lord	My Indian Years.
Karmarkar, D. P.	Bal Gangadhar Tilak, A Study.
Macdonald, J. Ramsay	The Awakening of India.
Majumdar, Bimanbehari	History of Political Thought.
Minto, Countess Mary	India, Minto and Morley.
Morley, John Viscount	Recollections, Vol. II.
Mukherjee, Haridas and Mukherjee, Uma (Mukherjees)	India's Fight for Freedom -I. The Origins of the National Education Movement. -II. Jatiya Andolane Satischandra Mukhopadhyaya (in Bengali).
Nevinson, H. W.	The New Spirit in India.
O'Donnell, C. J.	The Causes of Present Discontent in India.
O'Dwyer, Sir M. F.	India as I knew it.
Parvate, T. V.	Bal Gangadhar Tilak.
Ram Gopal	I. Indian Muslims. II. Lokamanya Tilak, a Biography.
Singh, G. N.	Landmarks in Indian Constitutional and National Development.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

The Second Volume of the *History of the Freedom Movement in India* covers the period from 1905 to 1918. Both the dates are great landmarks in the history of India's struggle for freedom. The *Swadeshi* movement, which commenced in 1905 as a protest against the Partition of Bengal, was at first a purely local movement directed against a specific administrative measure concerning only the Province of Bengal. But within an incredibly short time it led to, and merged itself in, a national struggle of All-India character against the British, which never ceased till India won her independence. This aspect of the Swadeshi movement is not always clearly recognized. An eminent professor of Indian history, while criticising my view that the outbreak of 1857 was not "a national rising to drive the British out of India", observes: "If the Swadeshi Movement of Bengal which came into existence on account of the partition of that Province by Lord Curzon and was originally confined to Bengal could be a national movement, the Revolt of 1857 which covered the whole of Uttar Pradesh, a part of the Panjab, some parts of Rajputana and Central India and Western Bihar and which had its repercussions in Maharashtra, too, could have an equal, if not superior, claim to be considered a national movement for the overthrow of the British rule in India." (*Uttara Bharati*, Vol. IV, pp. 131-2).

This poses a question which must be seriously considered. It will be readily admitted that a national movement of India must be (1) national in character, (2) inspired by the distinct and conscious object of gaining political freedom of India, and (3) sustained and well-organized until the object is achieved, or at least for a reasonably long period in order to leave as a legacy a spirit to revive the movement when opportunity again offers itself. There is some truth in the observation that the "Freedom's battle once begun, passes from sire to son", and goes on till it is finally won—though it may not be always literally true.

That the above elements were wanting in the outbreak of

1857 I first pointed out in my book, *The Sepoy Mutiny and the Revolt of 1857* (in course of reviewing which the observations quoted above were made by the distinguished historian), and reiterated in the First Volume of this work (pp. 242-258)[1]

So far as the *Swadeshi* movement is concerned, it also lacked the above elements at the beginning. But due to the growth of a strong national feeling, or some other reasons, the struggle against the British, conducted in a novel way by the Bengalis, was taken up by the rest of India. Further, the original object and scope of the movement, namely, to buy *Indian* and boycott *foreign goods,* led to a wider conception of upholding *everything* Indian at the cost of the foreign and a grim determination to achieve the liberty of India from foreign control. This point has been fully developed in pages 128 to 139.[2] Particular attention may be drawn to the views of eminent leaders like Gokhale and Gandhi (pp. 130-31)[3] about the silent transformation of the *Swadeshi* movement into a great national movement which carried on a successful struggle for freedom. I have pointed out that no contemporary Indian leader regarded the outbreak of 1857 as a movement or struggle for freedom, and that all those whose views were expressed in writing and are available today denied its character as a popular movement or national struggle for freedom. On the other hand, Gokhale in 1905 identified *Swadeshi* with the highest type of patriotism (p. 200)[4] and decalred in 1907 that *Swadeshism* was not merely an industrial movement but affected the whole life of the nation (p. 131).[5] Dadabhai Naoroji, in his Presidential Address at the Congress Session in 1906, referred to *Swadeshism* as the "cradle of New India." Gandhi wrote in 1908 that the real awakening of India took place after the Partition of Bengal which might lead to the partition of the British Empire. He also observed that "the demand for the abrogation of the Partition is tantamount to a demand for Home Rule." (p. 131).[6] Lala Lajpat

---

1. pp 211-25 of the second edition (1971).
2. pp. 117-126 of this edition.
3. p. 119 of this edition.
4. p. 187 of this edition.
5. p. 119 of this edition.
6. Ibid.

Rai, in 1905, speaking about the *Swadeshi* movement, observed: "I think the people of Bengal ought to be congratulated on being leaders of that march in the van of progress.....And if the people of India will just learn that lesson from the people of Bengal, I think the struggle is not hopeless." Not only Surendra Nath Banerji (p. 130),[1] Arabinda Ghosh and other leaders of Bengal, but G. Subramania Iyer, the eminent leader of Madras (p. 132),[2] and many other leaders from different parts of India have expressed similar views.

Thus the *Swadeshi* movement acquired an All-India and national character almost immediately after its birth. It was the repercussion of this movement on Indian politics that gave rise to the Extremist or Nationalist Party under Tilak, Arabinda, Lajpat Rai, Khaparde and other leaders, and radically changed the conception of political goal and the method to achieve it, upheld by the Indian National Congress since its inception in 1885. In so doing, it brought about a great upheaval of nationalist sentiment all over India. This newly born nationalism expressed itself first in the Home Rule Movement of Tilak and Besant, and then in the Non-co-operation movement of Mahatma Gandhi. It will thus be seen that the *Swadeshi* movement may be compared to a tiny brook, which gradually widened itself by receiving affluents and tributaries and became a mighty torrent of nationalism before it merged itself into the broad stream of India's national struggle for freedom. The outbreak of 1857, on the other hand, was a series of local outbreaks without any relation with one another, which lasted only a little over a year and left no trace behind to stimulate the people to further activities. Far from invigorating the people it put the British firmer on their saddle.

The above points, to which others may be added, would make it clear that the *Swadeshi* movement stands on an entirely different footing from the outbreak of 1857, so far as the national struggle for the freedom of India is concerned.

But whatever we may think of the outbreak of 1857, enough has been said to indicate that the *Swadeshi* movement

---

1. p. 118 of this edition.
2. p. 120 of this edition.

really marks the beginning of that continuous struggle which ultimately led to India's freedom. This truth, though not clearly perceived by all, even in India, has not escaped the discerning eye of foreign historians. Will Durant, for example, observes: "It was in 1905, then, that the Indian Revolution began" (*The Case for India*, p. 123). Not only this, but a closer examination will reveal the fact that almost all the characteristic features that marked India's struggle for freedom up to 1947, may be traced to the *Swadeshi* movement. Even the Non-co-operation and Passive Resistance—the two *Brahmastras* (potent, *lit.* divine, weapons) with which Mahatma Gandhi is supposed to have fatally struck the British rule in India,—as well as the concomitant circumstances—terrible repression on the part of the Government and the heroic courage, sufferings, and self-sacrifice on the part of the people—had their origin in the *Swadeshi* movement. Arabinda preached Non-co-operation and Passive Resistance (pp. 176 ff.)[1] during the *Swadeshi* movement, long before Gandhi, and also aaticipated his enunciation of the high moral and spiritual values of a non-violent struggle.*

All the oppressive and terrorising weapons in the armoury of the British Government which were hurled by them against the people till 1947 were first brought into operation against the *Swadeshi* movement in Bengal. The difference between the political ideologies of the Moderates and he Extremists, and of the Hindus and the Muslims, which the *Swadeshi* movement generated, persisted till the very end. It is impossible to understand the history of India's struggle for freedom in its true perspective without a thorough knowledge of the *Swadeshi* movement in its different aspects. It is for this reason that the *Swadeshi* movement looms large in the history of the freedom movement in India and considerable space has been devoted to it in this Volume. In writing this chapter I have derived considerable help from the published works of Prof. Haridas

---

* He said: "On their fidelity to *Swadeshi*, to boycott, to passive resistance, rested the hope of a peaceful and spiritual revolution, on that it depended whether India would give the example unprecedented in history of a revolution worked only by moral force and peaceful pressure." Tilak by T. V. Parvate, p. 520).

1. p. 166 of this edition.

Mukherjee and Prof. Uma Mukherjee bearing upon this subject. I take this opportunity to offer my thanks to these two pioneers in this field of study which, though very important and interesting, has been sadly neglected by our Universities.

Another topic to which unusual prominence has been given in this Volume is the militant aspect of nationalism, generally referred to as terrorism. The followers of this cult of violence, who should be more properly called revolutionaries, have suffered in the estimation of the people as a result of the preaching of the cult of *Ahimsa* (non-violence) by Mahatma Gandhi. Without belittling in any way the high ethical idea behind this cult it may be pointed out that non-violence was never known to have played any important role in practical politics, specially where a struggle against a highly organized military power was concerned. Its potency and effectiveness, as a political weapon, will be discussed in connection with Gandhi. But even taking the most optimistic and charitable view of the extent of success achieved by him through non-violence, there is no gainsaying the fact that it is still an unknown factor of doubtful value, whereas 'terrorism' has always and everywhere been recognized as an important factor in a fight for wresting independence from the unwilling hands of a powerful enemy. Views of eminent persons in support of terrorism as a political weapon have been quoted at 467 ff,[1] pages and the Britishers, against whom it was directed in India, have commended and approved terrorism in other countries in circumstances similar to those prevailing in India (p. 468).[2] No one has therefore a right to condemn the cult of violence or minimize its importance in the struggle for freedom. Even a political leader like Surendra Nath Banerji, most violently opposed to terrorism, admitted that the "revolutionary movement in Bengal was backed by men whose selfless devotion to the country could not be called in question." Nor did he regard it, in the abstract, as a hopeless movement. For he observed that it failed, for "in modern times revolutionary movements have only been successful with the aid of trained and organized armies." This truth was not unknown to the Indian

---

1. pp. 434 ff. of this edition.
2. p. 435 of this edition.

revolutionaries, for their plan included the seducing of the Indian troops to their cause. The revolutionary movement in India may justly claim a prominent place in the history of freedom movement in India on several grounds. In the first place, at a time when political work was looked upon by most people as a pastime of leisure hours, the leaders of the movement as well as the rank and file set the example of placing their whole time and whole life at the service of the motherland in a spirit of devotion. This is particularly noteworthy, as these people did not work in the limelight and had no hope for praise, reward, or even appreciation by the public which normally serve to keep up the spirit of political workers. They were solely inspired by the idea of overthrowing British rule in India, and voluntarily gave up peaceful domestic life for one of sacrifice and sufferings of all kinds including imprisonment, inhuman torture and death. Many of them were shining examples of courage, heroism, nobility of soul and high idealism to such a degree that any nation in the world would feel proud of claiming them as its own.

Secondly, the fact to be specially remembered is the wide extent of the movement. It spread its tentacles not only in various parts of India but also far outside its boundary, across the seas, in distant parts of Asia, Europe and America. The skill and ingenuity displayed in creating and maintaining this far-flung network of revolutionary organizations extort our unstinted admiration.

Thirdly, the large band of revolutionaries who chose a life of exile for many years—some for life—far away from their motherland, rendered yeoman's service to the cause of India's freedom by propagating true facts about the nature of British rule in India to people hitherto kept in ignorance or misled by the false propaganda of the British, and succeeded in evoking sympathy and enlisting support to India in her struggle for freedom.

Fourthly, there can be hardly any doubt that the political concessions made by the British during the period under review were due more to the revolutionary movement than to the constitutional agitation for freedom.

It is true that the revolutionary movement, by itself, failed to achieve freedom; but this may also be said of the Congress

politics and the Home Rule Movement of Tilak. Even the Non-co-operation Movement of 1921-22, and the Civil Disobedience Movement of 1930-34, ended, ostensibly, in a miserable failure. Yet who can deny that each of these successive movements contributed to the final victory? The value of a movement must be judged by what it achieved rather than by what it failed to accomplish. No single movement can claim the credit of achieving the freedom of India, but every organized movement inspired by the love of the motherland, such as those mentioned above, contributed its quota, the value of which it is the business of the historian to assess. Urged by this feelings, and in view of general ignorance and misunderstanding on the subject caused by the new-fangled ideas of nonviolence in politics propagated by Gandhian school of thought, I have devoted a large amount of space to this topic.

It is always a difficult problem to collect authentic information about the revolutionary movement. For, from the very nature of things, the work had to be carried on in secret, and written records of activity or programme of work were out of the question. We have to depend largely upon official records and reports, and the memoirs of individual revolutionaries. I was able to collect much valuable information about the Ghadar movement during my stay in U. S. A. for about a year in 1958-9 and I have utilized all this in this Volume. As the sources from which I culled information are not easily accessible in this country, I have tried to incorporate as many important records as possible, even at the risk of making the section perhaps a litle too loog.

The revolutionaries have passed away or are passing away —in most cases, unwept, unhonoured and unsung. The least that independent India can do to show due honours to these who lived and died for their country, is to perpetuate their memory by compiling a faithful record of what they did and how they suffered for their motherland. Now that, thanks to the Chinese aggression, the cult of non-violence has met with a violent end after a brief tenure of life, and India is faced with *real-politik*, a very useful purpose will be served by perpetuating the memory of those martyrs, as it is sure to inspire generations yet unborn to emulate the heroic self-sacrifice

of the revolutionaries in order to maintain that freedom which they had helped to achieve.

It is always a difficult task to deal with recent events which still evoke unpleasant memories or angry passions. A few of them are dealt with in this Volume; e.g., the difference between the Moderates and the Extremists, temporary split between them in 1907, and the final separation in 1918. I have tried to present all the relevant facts and express my views as dispassionately as possible. I have nothing to add to what I have said on this subject in a general way in the Preface to the First Volume. The same remark applies to the Hindu-Muslim relations and deline-ation of the British policy towards India.

I may again remind the readers that this Volume merely narrates the struggle for freedom and, therefore, deals only with the events and movements connected with it. It is not intended to be a history of the period 1905-18. This accounts for the ex-clusion of a great deal of matter and even of some momentous political, social, and economic issues, which might puzzle the readers. The reference to the activities of eminent leaders like G. K. Gokhale, for example, might be regarded as very inade-quate recognition of his services to the country. But it should be remembered that his services, valuable as they were, were largely in the intellectual sphere and in the Council halls, and though useful for educating public opinion and in other ways, had no direct bearing on the freedom movement. As a matter of fact, I would have been very glad if I could omit any refer-ence to some of his views and activities mentioned in this work. For, far from helping the movement for freedom initiated by Arabinda, Tilak, and their followers, Gokhale acted as a force of reaction against it. There is no doubt that Gokhale, like Pheroze Shah Mehta, Surendra Nath Banerji, and other leaders of the Moderate party, honestly acted in the light of their own judgement of what constituted the best interests of their country. But history is no respecter of persons and must make a dispas-sionate but critical estimate of the value of contributions made by each to the achievement of freedom. There is hardly any doubt that judged from this point of view, Tilak must be assign-ed a much higher place than Gokhale, though during their life-

time, the position, in public estimation, was probably just the reverse.

As stated in the preface to the First Volume, this Volume deals with the third phase of the struggle for freedom which began with the *Swadeshi* movement and ended with the transfer of political leadership from Tilak to Gandhi. Although Tilak died on 1 August, 1920, he was absent from India from 19 September, 1918, to 27 November, 1919, and this period witnessed the emergence of Gandhi as a great leader. Tilak, no doubt, fully maintained his power and popularity as the greatest political leader till his death in 1920, but the year 1919, in which momentous events took place in India during Tilak's absence, really forms the period of transition between the leadership of Tilak and that of Gandhi.

The year 1918, with which this Volume closes, therefore marks the end of an era in India's struggle for freedom and the beginning of another. The period from 1905 to 1918, which forms the subject-matter of this Volume, was dominated by Arabinda and Tilak;—the former putting nationalism and patriotism on the high pedestal of religion, and the latter bringing them to the masses and thus making them inspiring forces in practical politics. They gave the death-blow to the old Congress ideal and method, and substituted for them Home Rule and Mass Resistance movements, which loomed large in the active political programme of Nationalist India. But though Tilak led the people to the Pisgah Mount, he was not destined to take them to the Promised Land. That glory was reserevd for new leaders who took up the thread where Arabinda and Tilak had left it, and continued the task left unfinished by them. Under the magnetic influence of Gandhi's personality the masses, awakened from agelong slumber, cast off their lethargy and fearlessly marched on, through ups and downs, till a sudden turn of the world events and the heroic leadership of Netaji led them to the final stage in the struggle for freedom. The tiny brook of 1905, fed by many currents, rushed like a mighty river since 1919, till it reached the ocean. That story of epic grandeur will be told in the next and concluding Volume.

In my eagerness to see all the three Volumes of this history published during my lifetime, I had to expedite the printing of

this book, and am thankful o the Natun Press for having done the work in less than five months. This great hurry is responsible for some minor printing mistakes for which I can only crave the indulgence of my readers. Thanks are due to my daughter Srimati Sumitra Chaudhuri, B.A., for having prepared the Index.

4, Bepin Pal Road,
Calcutta-26.
February, 1963.

R. C. Majumdar

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

The first edition of this book, published in 1963, had long been out of print when this revised edition was sent to the press in May, 1972. Unfortunately, owing to well-known difficulties of the printing press, more than tyo years and a half have elapsed before the book is finally published.

The book has been thoroughly revised and important additions have been made in order to bring it up to date, meet criticisms and discuss some new views on important problems, Attention of the readers may be specially drawn to the following additions:

1. A new section entitled "Some Special Features of the Swadeshi Movement." (pp. 156-60) has been added.

2. The account of the Surat Session of the Indian National Congress in 1907 has been revised and considerably enlarged (pp. 196-203).

3. A new section entitled "Repercussions of Surat Congress" has been added (pp. 206-8)

4. Considerable changes have been made in the arrangement of Chapter VIII.

In particular.

(a) A new section entitled "Indian Revolutionaries Abroad" has been added at the beginning (pp. 363-5).

(b) The alleged association of poet Rabindranath Tagore with the Indian revolutionaries in U. S. A. has been definitely proved to be a fabrication (Cf. pp. 391-2, and p. 456, footnote 25 of the present edition with p. 418 and footnote 15 of Chapter VIII on pp. 546-7 of the First Edition.)

(c) Tilak's view on the so called Terrorism in India has been discussed at some length with quotations from his own writings (pp. 441-3).

4. Some new facts and theories have been added regarding the information supplied to the Police about the preparation of bombs in the Muraripukur garden, the means by which the re-

volver with which Naren Gossain was killed was carried to the Alipore Jail (p. 307, footnotes 4 a, 4 b), and the spot from which the bomb was thrown at Lord Hardinge in Delhi (p. 424 and p. 457, footnote 43a).

5. A new section has been added on the revolutionary centre at Chandernagore (p. 264).

6. An Appendix has been added on the later career of Arabinda with special reference to his flight from Calcutta to Chandernagore (pp. 359-61).

7. An account of the mutiny of the Jat Regiment in Calcutta in 1910 (pp. 281-2) which is not previously noticed in any book.

8. The description of the National Flag exhibited by Madam Cama at the International Socialist Congress which met at Stuttgart on 18 August, 1907 (pp. 302, 308, footnote 18a).

As in the revised edition of the First Volume, so in this Volume, too, the footnotes, instead of being placed together at the end, have been transferred to the end of the relevant chapter.

I take this opportunity of offering my sincere thanks to the different journals and newspapers, both in India and outside, for their appreciative review of the first edtion of the three volumes. My special thanks are due to the "American Historical Review" (April, 1962, January, 1964) for a comparative estimate of my "History of the Freedom Movement" and that by Dr. Tarachand, published by the Government of India, Thanks are also due to my daughter Sumitra Chaudhuri B.A. for having prepared the Index of this Volume.

3 March, 1975
4 Bepin Pal Road
Calcutta 26.

R. C. Majumdar

BOOK III

THE ERA OF NATIONALISM

CHAPTER I

THE PARTITION OF BENGAL

1. HISTORY OF THE PARTITION

The reactionary regime of Lord Curzon is a great landmark in the history of the freedom movement in India. His attempts to establish control over the universities and municipalities created great discontent and provoked keen protest all over India. But the crowning act of his folly was the partition of Bengal in the teeth of an angry, unanimous opposition, the like of which was never seen before during the British rule. This administrative measure which he carried through by riding roughshod over the feelings and sentiments of more than forty millions of people called forth all the latent forces of nationalism which had been gathering strength for years. Ere long, the protest took the form of *Swadeshi* movement which soon outstripped its original limitations of space and object and merged itself into an all-India national struggle for achieving freedom from the British yoke. That struggle continued through ups and downs, but without a break, until freedom was won. So, viewed in true perspective, the partition of Bengal set the ball rolling and ultimately smashed the imperial fabric which the British had reared with so much care in India. As Gandhiji truly prophesied, the partition of Bengal led to the partition of the British empire.[1]

Since the constitution of Assam as a separate Province under a Chief Commissioner in 1874, with the three Bengali-speaking districts of Goalpara, Cachar and Sylhet attached to it, the Presidency of Bengal comprised, besides Bengal proper, Bihar, Orissa and Chota Nagpur. It was the most populous Province in British India, having an area of 189,900 square miles, with a population of 78½ million, and a gross revenue of more than eleven crores. The Government regarded the size of the Province to be too unwieldy to be properly administered by a single person, and the idea of reducing its size was raised from time

to time. It is not necessary for our present purpose to discuss either the long history of the scheme of partitioning the Bengali-speaking area, or the justice and wisdom of the various measures which were proposed or given effect to before Lord Curzon took up the question. Towards the end of the year 1903 Lord Curzon's Government proposed to separate the whole of Chittagong Division and the Districts of Dacca and Mymensingh from Bengal, and to incorporate them with Assam. The publication of this scheme of partitioning the homogeneous Bengali-speaking area was the signal for an outburst of public indignation all over Bengal. Not only the professional poilticians but even the big landlords led the protest and they were joined by every class of people, both Hindus and Muslims. Even the *Englishman*, the orthodox Anglo-Indian Daily in Calcutta, and the Bengal Chamber of Commerce, representing European traders, offered opposition to the scheme. Protest meetings were held in towns and villages, no less than 500 being held in East Bengal alone within two months. Pamphlets and leaflets opposing the scheme and pointing out the grave evils arising from it were issued in hundreds, probably in thousands.[1a]

Lord Curzon undertook a tour in East Bengal "ostensibly with the object of ascertaining public opinion, but really to overawe it."[2] He was soon convinced of the strength and solidarity of public opposition to any scheme for partitioning Bengal. This evidently confirmed his views about the strength of Bengali nationalism and the danger it spelt to British rule in India. He therefore decided to remove this danger, before it was too late, by effectively destroying the soldidarity of the Bengalis. He now conceived the much more comprehensive plan of dividing the Bengali speaking area into two separate Provinces—the whole of Northern and Eastern Bengal with Assam forming the Province of Eastern Bengal and Assam, and Western Bengal with Bihar and Orissa constituting the Province of Bengal. The motive behind it was quite clear. In East Bengal, the Muslims, politically less advanced and more loyal to the British than the Hindus, would be in a majority, while in Bengal the Bengalis would form a minority by the inclusion of Bihar and Orissa. Thus the Bengalis would be divided from their kith and kin ; the Bengali Hindus, hated and dreaded by Curzon for their

advanced political ideas, would form a minority in both Provinces ; and a thin wedge would be driven between the Hindus and Muslims of Bengal. It was undoubtedly a master-plan to destroy the nascent nationalism in Bengal.

This sinister plan was hatched in secret. While violent protests against the earlier scheme were still agitating the whole of Bengal, and the Indian National Congress passed resolutions against it in 1903 and 1904, the Government gave out that no decision was reached on the subject. A Conference of 300 delegates from different districts was held in Calcutta on 11 January, 1905, with Sir Henry Cotton, the President of the Congress session of 1904, in the Chair. The President observed : "If Partition was at all necessary on the ground of administrative convenience, the real solution lay in establishing in Bengal a Presidency Governorship, and if even after that any territorial dismemberment was felt to be imperative, then Bihar and Chota Nagpur might be separated and transformed into a Chief Commissionership to the satisfaction of the Behari population, and Sylhet and Cachar, the two predominantly Bengali-speaking districts, might be added to Bengal from Assam much to the satisfaction of the Bengalis." The Conference passed the following resolution :

"That this Conference has learnt with a sense of relief that no decision has yet been arrived at by the Government on the question of the proposed partition of Bengal, and the Conference prays that if the scheme of Partition has undergone any modification or expansion as stated in some of the leading Anglo-Indian newspapers, the revised scheme be laid before the public for discussion before the Government of India arrives at a final decision on the subject."

In May, 1905, the *Standard* of London published the news that the Secretary of State had agreed to the proposal of Partition. In reply to a question in the House of Commons by Mr. H. Roberts, Mr. Brodrick, the Secretary of State for India, replied that the question was still 'under consideration'. A telegram was immediately sent to the Secretary of State to postpone decision until a memorial representing the views of the Bengalis reached his hands. The memorial was drawn up and already signed by fifty to sixty thousand persons by July 4, 1905, when

Mr. H. Roberts asked the Secretary of State whether he was aware of it and would postpone decision till it was received. In reply Mr. Brodrick, the Secretary of State for India, said : "The proposals of the Government of India on this subject reached me on February 18 and I have already communicated to them the decision of the Secreary of State in Council accepting their proposals." The news that Assam with Dacca, Chittagong and Rajshahi Divisions of Bengal would be constituted as a separate Province first appeared in the Calcutta Press on 6 July, 1905, and next day it was officially announced from Simla. The revised scheme of Partition was conveyed to the public in the form of a Govrnment resolution dated 19 July, and published in the Calcutta Press on the 20th.

2. AGITATION AGAINST PARTITION

Mention has been made above of the outburst of indignation with which Lord Curzon's scheme of Partition, announced in 1903, was greeted all over Bengal, Since then the scheme was opposed at every stage at public meetings, and in newspapers, in Calcutta and all over Bengal. Even when the Government of India communicated on 7 July, 1905, their final scheme of Partition sanctioned by the Secretary of State, the leaders of Bengal did not take it lying down and refused to accept the Partition as a settled fact. The *Bengalee* edited by Surendra Nath, published on 7 July a leading article under the caption, 'A Grave National Disaster', which "forewarned the Government of an impending national struggle of the greatest magnitude in case the Government did not reverse their decision." "But let not the Government", he said, "lay the flattering unction to its soul that the country will acquiesce in these monstrous proceedings without a strenuous and persistent struggle in which no expense or sacrifice will be grudged and in which the people will not fail to take the utmost advantage of the constitutional resources at their disposal. We are not guilty of the smallest exaggeration when we say that we are on the threshold of an agitation, which, for its intensity and its universality, will be unrivalled in the annals of this provice."[3]

Seldom was a prophecy more literally fulfilled. On the basis of the data collected by the Indian Association, its Annual

Report for 1911 gives the following summary which cannot be very far from truth.

"From December 1903 to October 1905 more than 2000 public meetings, each attended by 500 to 50,00 people, both Hindus and Mussalmans, were held in different parts of East Bengal and West Bengal to protest against the partition. The Resolutions unanimously adopted at these meetings were regularly submitted to the Government of India as well as to the Secretary of State. The people of United Bengal, both Hindus and Mussalmans, Maharajas, Nawabs, Rajas, the educated community and the masses, met five times at the Calcutta Town Hall to give expression to their feeling and protest against this ill-advised measure. Memorials were submitted by the British Indian Association, the Bengal Landholders' Association, as well as from nearly all the important and recognised public bodies and associations in either part of the province, and in July 1905 when the public mind was in a state of feverish anxiety, a mammoth representation over the signature of about 70,000 people of all classes and communities was submitted to the Secretary of State from East Bengal. The Indian Press, both in Bengal as well as in other provinces, were unanimous in their condemnation of the proposed dismemberment of Bengal, and even a large section of the Anglo-Indian Press, some of which are recognised as semi-official organs, joined in the protest."[4] Indeed it is difficult to conceive of a more unanimous and persistent opposition to a Government measure ; there is certainly no precedent in the history of British rule in India. The deeply wounded sentiments of the Bengalis were expressed in pamphlets, the number of which exceeded a thousand ;—some put it at several thousands. The depth and sincerity of such sentiments may be gauged by the utterances of some eminent Bengali leaders. Surendra Nath's views have been quoted above. Reference may be made to the speeches of Ambika Charan Mazumdar, Bhupendra Nath Basu and Jogesh Chandra Chaudhury in the Bengal Legislative Council on 8 July, i.e., the very next day after the official announcement of the final scheme of Partition. Addressing the Lieutenant-Governor, who was in the Chair, Mr. Mazumdar said : "Sir, even the worst criminal has a right to be furnished with a copy of his indictment before he is condemned ;

but the Government have decided the fate of over 30 millions of His Majesty's innocent subjects even without a hearing." Mr. Bose added further that a great calamity, "a calamity unparalleled in the days of the Mughal or the Pathan", had befallen the nation. The unity of Bengal as well as the solidarity of the Bengali race was at stake. Henceforth the cup of bitterness will be our portion and all our energies and efforts must be directed to counteract the disintegrating influences that threaten to overwhelm us".

As soon as the scheme of Partition in its final form was announced, the Bengali-owned newspapers—both English and Bengali—made a tearing and raging campaign against it.

It was pointed out that as a result of Partition the Bengali-speaking population in the parent Province would be 17 million, while the Hindi speaking population would be 20 million to which the Oriya speaking population would be added. Thus the Bengalis would lose numerical preponderence in the new Province of Bengal. It was further pointed out that while the scheme proposed to unite the Oriya-speaking people in one Province, namely, Bengal, it separated a considerable section of the Bengalis from their own Province. We may prduce some comments of the Bengali newspapers to give an idea of the feeling which animated the people. The *Hitavadi* (7. 7 05) wrote: "The Bengali race has not within the last 150 years received another suih deadly shaft". The *Sandhya* (18. 7. 05) declared that the object of the Partition was to ruin the Bengalis and drive them towards the Europeans. The *Sanjivani* (13. 7. 05) wrote. "Lord Curzon has thrown a shaft at the heart of the Bengalis..... so long as the Bengali race is alive, they will suffer from this pang.....Lord Curzon will convert Bengal into a second Ireland." The feeling of discontent gradually gave place to a sense of exasperation. The *Charu Mihir* (18. 7. 05) wrote: "By disregarding the unanimous approaches of the entire Bengali-speaking nation, Lord Curzon has in a manner proclaimed that the English have no right to remain in India but by the force of arms."

Lord Curzon and his apologists tried to belittle the all-Bengal opposition to the Partition as one artificially got up, being engineered by interested persons in Calcutta. But this is best

refuted by the universal character of the opposition, at least in its initial stages. The Hindus were fully supported by the Muslims. As A. J. O'Donnel observes : "The Partition of Bengal was from the outset condemned by all that was best, most noble and most educated amongst the Musalmans of Bengal. Even Musalman peasantry were hostile to it." "The English Press in India (*Englishman*, *Statesman*, *Pioneer*, *the Capital*, at first strongly condemned this measure. Practically the whole Civil Service of Bengal was hostile to the scheme and condemned it as the most unsuitable for the province, injurious to British Administration and financially wasteful."[5] Even Sir Bamfylde Fuller, who later achieved great notoriety as the first Lieutenant-Governor of the newly created Province of East Bengal and Assam, condemned the Partition. Two influential members of Bengal Chamber of Commermce promised to support the agitation against Partition; even the Dooars planters protested against it. The High Court of Calcutta was also definitely against the Partition and characterized it as a 'retrogade and mischievous step.'

The Partition was also strongly condemned by some papers in England. The following is taken from a leading article in the *London Daily News* :

"In India the announcement seems to have come as a complete surprise. In 1903 Lord Curzon was compelled to bow to the storm of criticism aroused by a much smaller readjustment of areas, and positive consternation has been created by the present proposal under which twenty-five millions of the people of Bengal are without a word of consultation to be handed over to a new local administration.....The inhabitants of Bengal contain a large proportion of educated persons, very many of whom occupy positions of inflence and responsibility. What was there to prevent Lord Curzon taking counsel with the leading citizens and ascertaining the views of the localities concerned before enacting this tremendous change ? We are afraid the only answer is, that Lord Curzon well knew the views of the people, but declined to argue with them or to endeavour to persuade them..... That re-consideration is desirable, is obvious from every point of view. It cannot be good statesmanship to launch these new provinces in a condition

of seething discontent, or to alienate a third of our fellow-subjects in India."[6]

The character of the agitation and its universality deeply impressed even Lord Morley, the Secretary of State for India from 1906, and he flatly contradicted the great Pro-Consul Lord Curzon and his apologists when he admitted that the agitation against the Partition was not "the work of political wire-pullers and political agitators," but was the result of genuine feelings in the minds of the people "that they were going to suffer a great wrong and inconvenience."[7] Morley had also the candour to admit that the measure went solely and decisively against the wishes of most of the people concerned.

There is, however, no doubt that the solidarity of opposition against the Partition was gradually weakened. Lord Curzon won over Salimullah, the Nawab of Dacca, partly by advancing a loan at a very low rate of interest, and partly by holding out the hope that the interests of the Muslims will dominate the administration of the new Province, and the Nawab, as their leader, will occupy a unique position there, with Dacca, his own home, raised to the status of a great capital city of an opulent Province. The Nawab gradually became a great supporter of the Partition, and gathered a section of Muslims round him. The new administration, in its actual operation, openly favoured the Muslims, and the first Lieutenant-Governor, Fuller, said with reference to the two main sections of population, the Musalmans and Hindus, that they were like his two queens of Indian legends, the first being the *suo* (favoured) and the second, *duo* neglected).[8] No wonder that the followers of Salimullah would gain in strength

When the partition led to the *Swadeshi*, i.e. the movement for the use of indigenous and boycott of English goods, the Englishmen gradually became hostile to anti-Partition agitation, and withdrew their support from it. Injury to material interests proved a much stronger force than sympathy for a just cause.

3. REACTION TO THE PARTITION

Though the agitation against the Partition gradually lost the sympathy and support of the Englishmen in general

and a large section of the Muslims, it grew in strength under the leadership of Surendra Nath Banerji and his associates. But it soon ceased to be a mere protest and assumed the character of a challenge to the British authority and British people. For the first time in British-Indian history, the English educated people gave up the policy of mendicancy and were determined to stand on their own legs in the true spirit of neo-nationalism described above. In order to understand and appreciate fully the new turn that the agitation took, it is necessary to trace from the very beginning the gradual stages in the reaction to the Partition of Bengal, known in Bengal early in July and formally announced by the Government on 20 July, 1905.

As mentioned above, the announcement was a signal for a unique outburst of public indignation all over Bengal. The state of feeling then prevalent in Bengal has been thus described by Surendra Nath :

"In my younger days, I had read Macaulay's graphic account of the condition of English society on the eve of Civil War between Charles I and his Parliament—how the coming struggle overshadowed all other considerations, how it penetrated the homes of England and became the subject of conversation round every fireplace, how it leavened thought and moulded aspirations. Something of the same absorbing interest was roused by Lord Curzon's Partition of Bengal. The whole community felt a concern about a matter affecting their province such as they had never experienced before. The community was writhing under a sense of surprise and indignation."[9] The volume of public feeling may be guaged by the fact that even according to official estimates no less than 500 public meetings were held all over Bengal and a petition signed by about 75,000 people was submitted to Parliament.

Krishna Kumar Mitra, the editor of the *Sanjivani*, in its issue of 13th July, suggested that in view of the attitude of the Government people should boycott all British goods, observe mourning, and shun all contacts with officials and official bodies. This suggestion was accepted in a public meeting held at Bagerhat (Khulna District) on 16 July, 1905, in which the following resolutions were passed :

(1) All British and foreign goods should be boycotted until Partition orders were withdrawn.

(2) There should be no participation in any public amusement or rejoicing for six months.

In a letter published in the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* of 17 July, 1905, believed to have been from the pen of Lal Mohan Ghosh, a proposal was made to abandon and oppose the use of English goods, specially Manchester cloth, as a means of compelling the English to pay attention to the troubles in India.

A meeting was held at Dinajpur on the 21st of July. The Maharaja of Dinajpur presided and Lal Mohan Ghosh addressed the meeting. He said that he did not consider that any demonstration would be of any use. It was necessary to draw the attention of the British public by adopting concrete measures. He suggested withdrawal of support to the Government by

(1) Resignation in a body of all Honorary Magistrates.

(2) Resignation of all members of District Boards, Municipal Commissioners, and Panchayats in a body.

(3) National mourning for 12 months during which period the people should refuse to participate in any public rejoicing.

As a sign of mourning and protest a number of papers appeared with black borders. The first two suggestions were mooted for a long time but did not commend themselves to the leaders. It was felt that these bodies were a source of local influence which would be useful in the coming struggle.

The examples of Bagerhat and Dinajpur were "followed by Pabna on July 23, when the people of the locality assembled in a meeting presided over by the Zamindar of Tantibanda, Jnanada Govinda Chaudhury, and adopted the resolution of 'Boycott of foreign goods in the name of 'Swadeshi.' Similar protest-meetings were also held in Faridpur, Tangail, Magura, Bogra, Mymensingh, Jessore, Manickgunge, Narayangunge, Dacca, Birbhum and Rampurhat, and even in Nowgong of distant Assam. On Sunday, July 26, 1905, a large meeting was held in the open compound of the Braja Mohan College by the people of Barisal, presided over by Dinabandhu Sen, the leader of the local bar. Aswini Kumar Dutta was the main speaker on that occasion. Thus while Calcutta was talking, history was being made in the *mofussil*. In fact it was the forward march of the *mofussil* that

helped the leaders in the metropolis to determine the future line of action.''[10] The first important meeting of the students in Calcutta pledging themselves to the ideology of Boycott was held on 17 July in the Ripon College, and the next on 28 or 29 July 1905. This was followed by another meeting held on 30 July, when about two hundred students of the Eden Hindu Hostel adopted the Boycott resolution. There was a still bigger meeting on 31 July, when the students of all the Calcutta Colleges assembled for protest against Partition. Steps were also taken at this meeting for organizing Students' committees in the Colleges, both private and Government, for the purpose in view. [11] About the same time the leaders were holding almost daily conferences either in the Indian Association or at the residence of Maharaja Surya Kanta Acharya of Mymensing, and finally accepted the principle of Boycott throughout the country.[12]

The views of the hundreds of public meetings in Calcutta and *mofussil* and Conferences of the leaders prepared the ground for the great public meeting which was held on 7 August, 1905, at the Town Hall in Calcutta. It was a highly representative meeting, attended not only by the great leaders but also by the delegates of the districts of Bengal. 'The students of Calcutta, who had already taken the vow of 'Boycott' and '*Swadeshi*' at several meetings, played a very fruitful role on that day. The Town Hall meeting was scheduled for 5 P.M. ; but 'from two o'clock', reparts the *Englishman*, 'there was the unusual sign in the streets of Calcutta of processions of students marching, two by two, with blue pennons inscribed in Bengali with the words 'United Bengal'. The students were marshalled under their teachers in College Square'. There they stood in groups, each holding aloft black flags bearing words such as 'United Bengal', 'Unity is Strength', 'Bande Mataram' and 'No Partition''[13] ''With measured steps and heavy hearts'' a huge procession of students, estimated at not less than 5,000 in number, marched from College Square to the Town Hall, as if in a funeral procession. The shops were closed since the morning and business was largely suspended. So general and unanimous was the popular movement that, even according to police reports, in some sections of the town not even a bottle of lemonade could be obtained after noon.

The crowd that assembled near the Town Hall was so great that it was impossible to accommodate them all. "Rajas and pleaders and Babus jostled each other and the gathering shaded off into the poorest class." So, in addition to the main meeting held in the Hall, two overflow meetings had to be arranged. Maharaja Manindra Chandra Nandi of Cossimbazar took the chair at the principal meeting. He described the Partition as "the greatest calamity which has fallen upon the Bengali-speaking race since the commencement of British rule." The first resolution emphatically protested against the partition of Bengal and declared it to be unnecessary, arbitrary and unjust, and calculated to seriously interfere with the social, intellectual, moral and industrial advancement of the vast population concerned. It also stressed the fact that the Government resolution being passed in deliberate disregard of the opinion of the entire Bengali nation, has aroused a feeling of distrust against the present administration. A request was accordingly made to the Secretary of State either to withdraw the orders of Partition or to modify these orders. The second resolution protested against the procedure adopted by the authorities in dealing with the Partition question. The third resolution, which was the most important, was moved by the great Moderate leader, Narendranath Sen, and runs as follows : "That this meeting fully sympathises with the Resolution, adopted at many meetings held in the *mofussil*, to abstain from the purchase of British manufactures so long as the Partition Resolution is not withdrawn, as a protest against the indifference of the British public in regard to Indian affairs and the consequent disregard of Indian public opinion by the present Government." The fourth resolution emphasized the need of continuing the agitation till the Partition was reversed.

The 'Boycott' suggestion spread quickly all over the country. Public meetings were held in all important towns and hundreds of villages, in which resolutions were passed endorsing the Boycott proposal. According to official reports, meetings and processions took place daily in towns and large villages. In Barisal, at one meeting, an effigy of Lord Curzon was burnt, and mock *Sradh* ceremony performed. According to the same reports, shouting of *Bande Mataram* was adopted as the war cry

of the agitation, and the general attitude of the Bengalis towards Europeans became insolent and aggressive. In many papers suggestions were made to boycott the visit of the Prince of Wales, and resolutions to this effect were passed at many meetings.

The entire Bengali press vigorously supported the Boycott movement. Thus the *Hitabandhu* (24. 7. 05) wrote: "We know that England is governed by merchants.....If we can but once move the weavers of Manchester, they will perform a mass feat. All we have to do is to take a firm resolution not to use Manchester piece-goods and carry our resolution to effect... .....We will unite divided Bengal."

In the meantime the Government of India were in feverish haste to put into operation the entire scheme of Partition. On 3 August, 1905, they forwarded to the Secretary of State a draft proclamation and a draft Bill with the observation that in their opinion it was "most desirable that the scheme of reconstruction should be brought into force with the least possible delay, since to defer it would be to afford opportunities for the renewal of the agitation on the part of those opposed to the scheme".[14] The Secretary of State was equally prompt, and with his approval the Proclamations was published on 1 September, 1905. It was the final decision regardng Partition and gave a list of the districts in Bengal which, along with Assam, would "form a separate Province called the Province of Eastern Bengal and Assam". It was further stated that the new Province would be a Lieutenant-Governorship with Mr. Joseph Bampfylde Fuller, then the Chief Commissioner of Assam, as the first Lieutenant-Governor. Finally, it stated that the new arrangement would come into force from 16 October, 1905.

A section of the English people and even the Conservative British journal like the *Times* as well as the *Manchester Guardian* made adverse comments and expressed sympathy with the feelings of the Bengalis and the Anti-Partition agitation. In Bengal the Proclamation was looked upon as a challenge which was at once taken up by the classes and masses combined. The popular movement was intensified. A new spirit was manifested all over the country. It was marked by a high degree of patriotic fervour and religious devotion to motherland, sym-

bolized by *Bande Mataram*. Even in the small town of Barisal, students as well as teachers in some schools went barefooted to the school. All over the country the students held meetings and organized processions. The Government took strong measures. 275 students were turned out of their classes, and all were threatened with expulsion in case they refused to return with their shoes on. In some cases the students purchased foreign salt and sugar and destroyed them. But the agitation was the strongest in Calcutta. The Town Hall meeting of 7 August was followed by a number of open-air meetings attended by large groups of students. Thereafter the picketing system was started and parties of college students and school boys commenced to parade the *bazar* dissuading customers from purchasing foreign goods. They even requested the purchasers with folded hands to return the English goods purchased by them and not to do so in future. Generally speaking, the attitude of these boys was peaceful, but on some occasions there might have been some altercations or disputes. On these slight pretexts, and even when such pretexts were altogether absent, the police beat the students by *lathi* (thick bamboo sticks), and many of them were even arrested on the most flimsy charges. In the markets, both of towns and villages, the boycott and picketing were in full swing. The police report says that this was mainly due to the support of the land-holders who actively enocuraged the boycott through their 'naibs' and peons. But although this may be true, there is no mistaking the fact that the spirit of boycott moved the people, both high and low. The cobblers in Mymensingh refused in a body to mend English shoes. The Oriya cooks and servants in Barisal held a meeting declaring that they would not serve masters using foreign goods. The washermen of Kalighat held a meeting and passed a resolution boycotting the washing of the foreign clothes. The cobblers of Faridpur refused to mend European shoes, and the washermen to wash European clothes. Some remarkable instances may be cited to show the depth of this feeling among the middle classes. A young girl of 6 refused to take foreign medicine even when she was seriously ill. The priests refused to officiate in marriage ceremonies where foreign clothes were used. The students refused to appear in the examination on the ground

that the answer books supplied to them were made of foreign papers. The orthodox 'pandits' lent their support to the movement and laid down that the use of foreign salt and sugar was not sanctioned by Hindu religion. So strong was this feeling among the Bengalis that the Englishmen, who had hitherto supported the anti-partition agitation, now called upon the Government to strike at the root of the Boycott movement. The European merchants of Calcutta threatened to dismiss all their Bengali clerks as a sort of reply to boycott. The Anglo-Indians threatened to unsheathe the sword which, they said, they had sheathed 50 years ago.

The meeting of 7 August may be fittingly described as the beginning of the grim struggle between the people and the Government. The student community, in particular, was caught in the grip of revolution, and fearlessly carried the message of Boycott and *Swadeshi* from one end of the Province to the other. Surendra Nath observes :

"It was the fervour of the students that communicated itself to the whole community and inspired it with an impulse, the like of which had never been felt before. It was a strange upheaval of public feeling. The Swadeshi movement invaded our homes and captured the hearts of our women-folk, who were even more enthusiastic than the men. A grand-daughter of mine, only five years old, returned a pair of shoes that had been sent to her by a relative, because they were of foreign make. The air was surcharged with the *Swadeshi* spirit, and it is no exaggeration to say that our young men were the creators of this stupendous moral change."[15] In the movement thus sweeping over the country, all classes of people in this Province joined hands in the common cause. "Some of the leading noblemen", wrote the *Bengalee*, "who had hitherto hesitated to join the movement of protest found that they had no alternative but to swell the chorus". "Nor was it all-too-Hindu in character. In spite of British machinations of "divide and rule" and the attempt to work upon the religious sentiments of the Muslims, the Muslim community could not escape the impact of the new spirit. It threw out leaders from its bosom, and men like Abdul Rasul, Liakat Hossain, Abdul Halim Ghaznavi,

Yusuf Khan Bahadur, Mohammad Ismail Chowdhury became its trusted and accreditned exponents."[16]

It is impossible to over-estimate the part played by the Bengali-owned newspapers in propagating the ideas of Boycott and *Swadeshi*. They. one and all, fearlessly voiced the popular feelings and the grim determination to fight to the last. Every village post-office was surrounded at the time of the arrival of mail by crowds of anxious villagers, mostly illiterate, who came from far and near to hear someone read the Bengali papers, which gave them the fatest news of the progress of the movement in different parts of the country, and filled their hearts with hope and courage. Everybody looked to Calcutta for inspiration and guidance, and the leaders there gave a good account of themselves. The Dawn Society which, under the leadership of Satis Chandra Mukherji, was "functioning, since 1902, as a training-ground of youths and a nursery of patriotism, became in 1905 one of the most active centres for the propagation of Boycott-Swadeshi ideologies after August 7. While Satis Chandra was suggesting the line of constructive *Swadeshi*, and Surendra Nath and Bipin Chandra were inspiring the students to move forward with the movement by their fiery flashes of oratory, Rabindra Nath also appeared on the scene as the poet of patriotism."[17] Day after day national poems and songs, of inimitable words and sweetest melody, came out from his pen. They not only charmed and enthralled his countrymen, both young and old, but like the war-song inspiring soldiers engaged in a grim battle, they fostered the spirit of revolution and kept up its fire. Other poets, like D. L. Roy and Rajani Kanta Sen, also awakened the national spirit and helped to maintain its high tempo by patriotic poems and songs. All these acquired tremendous popularity and were sung all over Bengal, even in the remotest villages. Indeed this literary outburst, which continued for many years and expressed itself later also in dramas and other forms, may be regarded as one of the most distinctive characteristics of the *Swadeshi* movement in Bengal, which one misses in all subsequent national movements in India, not excluding the great Non-co-operation and Civil Disobedience movements launched by Mahatma Gandhi. It is impossible to give an adequate idea of the crowded public meetings and rallies

of students, attended by thousands in Calcutta and all over Bengal. The students generally appeared in mourning, barefooted and singing patriotic songs. In every meeting the boycott of English goods was resolved upon amid deafening shouts of *Bande Mataram* which had now become the war-cry of the peaceful fighters for the motherland.

Two features of the agitation deserve particular notice. The first was a big meeting of the Muslims on 23 September, 1905, "at Raja Bazar, with Abdul Rasul in the chair. Three resolutions were passed, (i) recording the protest of the Mahomedan community against the current report to the effect that they had no sympathy with the measures adopted by the Hindus for the amelioration of their country and offering their support to the Hindus : (ii) expressing their desire to join the Hindus not merely regarding the Partition but also other matters ; (iii) and also expressing their strong support in favour of the use of Swadeshi goods."[18] The second notable feature was the spread of the agitation outside Bengal. "In early September, 1905, a monster meeting, held at French Chandernagore with its Mayor M. Leon Tardival in the chair, passed resolutions for the vigorous conduct of the boycotting of British goods. Surendra Nath Banerji and Kali Prasanna Kavyavisharad delivered fiery speeches on the occasion. Even in distant Mandalay a protest meeting against the Bengal Partition was held on September 13. News of such meetings expressing sympathies with the Bengalis, also came from Agra and Rawalpindi."[19]

It is difficult to convey an adequate idea of the impulse which now convulsed the whole of Bengal. The original feeling against partition now developed into a fullfledged patriotic fervour to which was added an element of religious feelings. This was very clearly manifested in the great *Puja* which was held at the famous temple at Kalighat on the occasion of the *Mahalaya* on 28 September. The following account is culled from the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* of 29 September, 1905.

"In spite of a regular cyclone accompained by heavy downpour from 9 in the morning, bands of men and processions of students began to proceed towards the temple barefooted through Chitpur Road and Cornwallis Street. And as the day advanced, the gathering thickened till at 2 p.m., the spacious *Natmandir*

in front of the temple and the quadrangle on its west was nowhere. It was all one piece of humanity.

"*Sankirtan* parties from various parts of the city and suburbs came and sang before the Goddess the whole day. Not less than one hundred *sankirtan* parties singing national songs and carrying flags bearing suitable mottoes visited the shrine.

"The gathering was estimated to be more than 50,000. It was not a gathering of boys nor of illiterate people. It was a respectable and representative gathering of the Hindu inhabitants of Calcutta and the neighbouring places, including the landed Hindu aristocracy, barefooted and dressed in holy silken clothes.

"But it was not a mere matter of crowds. The feeling was intense. This vast assembly, consisting of all grades of society, was led to congregate before the Goddess on that auspicious day—the Mahalaya day—to offer up to the Goddess prayers for averting the doom of partition and to take a solemn vow to discard all foreign clothes. At about 11 O'clock the *Puja* began. It was followed by the *Homa* ceremony, which was a grand sight. A huge fire was burning in the centre of the *Natmandir* to which *Ghee* and other offerings, incense, sandalwood were incessantly supplied, accompanied by the uttering of *Mantras* by thousands of voices. They invoked the aid of the Goddess, the centre of all power, to give them strength at this critical hour.

'Then followed a scene which was the grandest of all and more imposing than all those which preceded it. The Brahmins in the temple uttered the following invocation in Sanskrit : 'Worship the motherland before all other deities ; give up sectarianism, all religious differences, animosities, and selfishness ; adopt one and all the pledge of serving the mother country and devote your lives to relieve her distress.'

"The assembly entered the *Natmandir* in batches and solemnly took the following vows : Mother, today, the auspicious day, standing before thy holy presence and in this place of sanctity, I solemnly promise that to the best of my power I will never use foreign articles, that I will not purchase such articles from foreign shops which are to be had at Indian shops, that I will not employ foreigners for work which could be done

by my countrymen." This solemn vow may be looked upon as the first declaration of war against the British.

As mentioned above, the Partition of Bengal was to take effect from 16 October, 1905. It was generally felt that the even should be marked by some special ceremonies, particularly with a view to emphasize the unity of Bengal. About the beginning of October Rabindra Nath Tagore issued to the public a letter written in Bengali of which the following is an English translation.

"On the 30th of *Aswin*, Bengal will be partitioned by legislation. To prove, however, that God did not ordain the severance of the race, it is proposed that the day should be commemorated by an observance of "*Rakhi Bandhan*", to indicate the indelible unity of the Bengali race.

"The '*Rakhi*' should be of yellow colour and the *mantra* to be uttered on the occasion of tying the sacret "*Rakhi*" thread on the arms of one another is : 'Brothers live united.' As on the auspicious day of the *Bijoya* every Bengali pays a formal visit to his friends and relations and interchanges mutual salutations, greetings and embraces, so the 30th of *Aswin* next should be observed as sacred every year for tying the *Rakhi* on the arm by every Bengali belonging to all parts of the country. Let that day be commemorated to indicate the indissoluble brotherhood between East Bengal men and West Bengal men, between rich and low, between Christians, Mohamedans, and Hindus born of soil. On that day the *Rakhi* is to be tied on the arm of every Bengali—a gift of kinship from the master to the servant, from the servant to the master, from the rich to the poor and from the poor to the rich— social distinction being merged in the all-embracing idea of national unity. This year the 30th *Aswin* will be the third day of the dark moon. We shall call it the *Rakhi Tritiya* day and observe it every year to commemorate our brotherhood and sacred union. On that day everyone should live on fruits and milk and thus practise *Sanjam* (abstinence). On that day the sacred *Rakhi* thread should be interchanged amongst people of different parts of the country. The *Rakhi* ceremony will indicate that no monarch's sword, however powerful, can cut asunder the bond of union implanted by Providence amongst people forming one and the

same race." A less poetic and more material way to achieve the same end was decided in a public meeting at the Town Hall, Calcutta, on 22 September. It was resolved by the representatives of Bengal to organize a Federation of the old and severed Provinces with a view "to maintain the unity and the solidarity of the Bengali race and to tighten the bonds between two Bengals after the partition takes place. This news was revealed to the public on 5 October in a statement which further informed the public that a piece of land had already been secured for the construction of the Federation Hall, the foundation-stone of which would be solemnly laid on 16 October, at 4 P.M. at 294 Upper Circular Road. The Hall was to be a symbol of the indissoluble union between the two provinces, a meeting-ground of the Eastern and Western Bengal."[20]

The scene which was witnessed on 16 October in Calcutta (and practically all over Bengal) defies all description. All the business was suspended and vehicular traffic stopped, and all the shops were closed for the whole day. Young men paraded the streets from before sunrise, singing *Bande Mataram* song, and a huge concourse of people marched towards the Ganga in order to take bath in the holy river. There were processions, *Sankirtans* (religious songs) and patriotic songs. After the bath in the sacred river the people met at different public places and there tied *Rakhi* on each other's arms. In the afternoon a meeting was held at Circular Road in order to lay the foundation of the Federation Hall, an assembly hall "which was to be the meeting-ground of the old province and its severed parts, the mark and symbol of their indivisible union." The meeting was attended by more than 50,000 people. Ananda Mohan Bose, a veteran political leader, who presided over the meeting, was then seriously ill and had to be brought to the meeting in an invalid chair. After the foundation stone was laid the following proclamation was read at the meeting ;

"Whereas the Government has thought fit to effectuate the partition of Bengal in spite of the universal protest of the Bengali Nation, we hereby pledge and proclaim that we, as a people, shall do everything in our power to counteract the evil effects of the dismemberment of our province and to maintain the integrity of our race. So God help us". A Bengali translation

of this proclamation was made by poet Rabindra Nath. After the ceremony was over the entire crowd, all barefooted, walked a distance of nearly 2 miles to the house of Pashupati Bose at Bagh Bazar. Even old and veteran leaders like Surendra Nath walked without shoes over the rough streets of Calcutta. A huge meeting was held at Bose's house, and a sum of Rs. 70,000/- was collected in the meeting itself for the promotion of *Swadeshi* movement. The subscription consisted mainly of small donations from the members present.

The history of the agitation against Partition may be fittingly close with he account of this memorable episode. For henceforth the agitation was really merged into the Boycott and *Swadeshi* movement which form the subject-matter of the next chapter.

But before concluding the topic it is necessary to add a few general observations. It has often been said that sentiment played a large part in the form that the anti-Partition agitation gradually assumed. This is no doubt true to a certain extent. But it should be remembered that *sentiment* always plays a large part in a revolutionary movement, as the anti-Partition agitation undoubtedly was. All revolutions proceed from discontent and grievances, which may be real and reasonable, or fanciful and imaginary, though more often than not the two elements are mixed in varying proportions. But the depth and sincerity of the discontent and sense of injury is the real basis of all revolutions, and it is the only instrument which, under capable leaders, ensures success in revolutionary struggle. The Partition of Bengal created a feeling of grave discontent and deeply injured sense of pride, such as has never been witnessed in Bengal before or since. But this by itself was not sufficient. It required capable leaders to canalise the sentiment into a mighty torrent struggling for undoing the wrong. Fortunately for Bengal such leaders were not wanting. There was a galaxy of leaders, both in Calcutta and *mofussil*, who gave the right direction to the national upsurge, till it out-stripped the narrow outlook which gave birth to it, and instead of merely re-uniting the divided portions of Bengal looked far into the horizon and regarded as its objctive nothing less than the expulsion of the British who inflicted such a deep wound on their hearts.

It is also necessary to remember that the ground for this type of agitation was already prepared towards the end of the 19th century. Eminent persons gave public expression to the view that instead of petitioning to the Government, which bore no fruit, we must stand on our own legs and turn to constructive work such as the promotion of industry, uplift of the masses by spreading education among them, etc. Rabindranath Tagore, in a general way, wrote many articles in this strain during the eighties, but in his *Swadeshi Samaj* (1904) and *Avastha o vyavastha* (1905) he chalked out a practical programme: to send volunteers to villages for the political enlightenment of the common people assembled in the *mela* (fairs) through magic lantern lectures ; establish unity and understanding between classes and masses by reviving old Hindu traditon,, etc. Particularly remarkable is his clarion call in the name of the Hindu religion. "Will not, ' he asked, "Hinduism forge a bond of unity for us all by generating a spirit of devotion for our motherland. Bharatavarsha, the pleasure-ground of our gods, the hermitage of our ancient sages and the dwelling place of our ancestors ?[21]" Outside Bengal, the Shivaji and Ganapati festivals,[22] inaugurated by Tilak in Bombay, echoed the same spirit by actions. In the Punjab Lajpat Rai had advocated in 1901 technical education and self-help. He further observed "that the Congress should openly and boldly base itself on the Hindus alone since unity with the Muslims is a chimera."[23] Similar other ways and means were suggested as substitutes for the policy of mendicancy which alone formed the policy and programme of the Indian National Congress so far. Out of the medley of these suggestions the one that ultimately caught the imagination of the people was the boycott of British goods, and this was adopted as the national policy in a meeting at the Town Hall, Calcutta, on 7 August, as mentioned above.

The obstinacy of the Government in pursuing the scheme of partitioning Bengal in the teeth of popular opposition, unprecedented in Indian history, may now be easily explained with the help of secret official documents. As it is very pertinent to the general question of the method adopted by the British Government to stem the tide of national resistance to it and nip

the struggle for freedom in India in the bud the point may be discussed in some detail.

Although the main argument advanced by the Government in favour of the Partition was the administrative consideration,[24] namely, lightening the burden upon Bengal, the real motive was to curb the growth of national feeling in politically advanced Bengal by driving a wedge between the Bengali speaking Hindus and Muslims, and destroying the solidarity of 78 millions of Bengalis by dividing them into two blocs. As this was persistently denied by Lord Curzon himself and the Government of India, it is necessary to refer to this point at some length. As far back as 1896, W. B. Oldham, the Commissioner of Chittagong Division, suggested the creation of a new province which would unite the most important part of Muhammadan population of Eastern India and thus reduce the "politically threatening" position of the Hindu minority in Bengal.[25] A few years later Sir Andrew Fraser expressed the feeling "that the influence of Eastern Bengal in the politics of the Province is very great and out of all proportion to its real political importance, in so much that the Bengali altogether overshadows the Bihari who is in everything save the use (or abuse) of language immeasurably superior' . He also regarded it as an "object of great political and administrative importance to diminish this influence by separating one of its great centres from others. Fraser represented all these personally to Lord Curzon who observed as follows in his own minute ;

"There remains an argument to which the incoming Lt. Governor of Bengal, Sir A. Fraser, attaches the utmost weight and which cannot be absent from our consideration. He has represented to me that the advantage of severing these Eastern Districts of Bengal which are a hotbed of purely Bengali movement, unfriendly if not seditious in character, and dominating the whole tone of Bengal administration, will immeasurably outweigh any possible drawbacks." That Lord Curzon had some secret motive which he did not like to divulge to the public is apparent from the following note in his minute :

'I regret to say that in my view if the letter to Bengal were published in its present form, it would create absolute consternation.....When I worte my minute for the confidential informa-

tion of my colleagues, it never occurred to me for a moment that its contents could be or would be practically reproduced to be dissected by every newspaper scribe, English or Native, in Bengal. What I could safely say in the privacy of the Council Chamber is not necessarily suitable for proclamation from the house tops.

"The Secretary in his anxiety to respect the form as well as the substance of what I wrote has produced a draft which would be disastrous. I have, therefore, revised it from beginning to end.

"Neither do I propose to send a copy of my minute home .....it will be sufficient if I send a copy privately to the Secretary of State to explain the inner meaning of that which it has not been found altogether advisable to say in the letter of Bengal." This minute bears the signature of Curzon dated 10.11.03.[26] There is no doubt that he refers to the letter of Risley mentioned to above, and there cannot be any manner of doubt that partition was not decided upon purely on administrative grounds because in that case there could have been no occasion for suppressing anything and hardly any justification for the language used by Lord Curzon.

Fortunately for historians, all doubts on the real motive for partitioning Bengal are set at rest by some recently published documents. When there was a proposal that instead of partitioning Bengal, Bihar might be separated and created a Chief-Commissionership, and Orissa might be transferred to the Central Provinces, it was opposed on the following grounds: "It would tend still further to consolidate Bengali influence and the so-called national sentiment. Instead of breaking up the present combination of political agitators and creating wholesome centres of provincial opinion, it would strengthen the predominance of the political organisations in Calcutta." The same despatch refers to the apprehensions of the Congress that the Partition would weaken the power of the Bengalis, and then adds : "Their apprehensions are perfectly correct and they form one of the great merits of the scheme. It is not altogether easy to reply in a despatch which is sure to be published without disclosing the fact that in this scheme as in the amalgamation of Berar to the Central Provinces one of our main objects

is to split up and thereby weaken a solid body of opponents to our rule."[27]

Curzon was more explicit in his letter to Brodrick dated 17 February, 1904. He writes: "The Bengalis, who like to think themselves a nation, and who dream of a future, when the English will have been turned out, and a Bengali Babu will be installed in Government House, Calcutta, of course, bitterly resent any disruption that will be likely to interfere with the realisation of this dream. If we are weak enough to yield to their clamour now, we shall not be able to dismember or reduce Bengal again ; and you will be cementing and solidifying, on the eastern flank of India, a force almost formidable, and certain to be a source of increasing trouble in the future."[28]

It may be added that the policy of dividing the politically advanced communities in separate provinces was already an accepted principle. In connection with the approaching incorporation of Berar with British India Curzon wrote in a note dated 6 March, 1903 : "I cannot contemplate any proposal which would add strength or solidarity of the Maratha Community with anything but dismay."[29] Fraser endorsed this view. He thought that the transfer of Berar to Bombay would mean the "tremendous political blunder of consolidating the whole Maratha Community of India under the influence and guidance of Poona."[30] Again, he observed : "The last thing we want to do is to consolidate the Mahratta race. We have quite enough of Shivaji as it is."[30a]

But Curzon and Fraser do not stand alone. A. T. Arundel, a member of the Viceroy's Council, wrote in a note, dated 19 June, 1903: "The reasons for transferring Mymensingh and Dacca are not so conclusive as in the case of Chittagong as regards development, *but I am impressed with the political reasons for severance* which are similar to those which assign Berar to the Central Provinces and which led me to demur to the political union of the Uriyas."[31] And this feeling seems to have been shared by the entire officialdom. Lord Minto, who succeeded Lord Curzon and did not approve of the manner in which the latter had carried out the Partition, wrote to Morley that he became more and more convinced that one of the objects of the Partition was to break the political influence of Bengal "which

might have become a preponderating factor difficult to deal with in questions affecting advanced Indian ideas, if the boundaries of Bengal had not been curtailed." That Minto fully approved of it is quite clear from another letter which he wrote to Morley: "I did not tell Gokhale that the crippling of Bengali political power is in my opinion one of the strongest arguments in favour fof Partition. It is the growing power of population with great intellectual gifts and a talent for making itself heard, a population which, though it is very far from representing the more manly characteristics of the many races of India, is not unlikely to influence public opinion at home most mischievously. Therefore from a political point of view alone, putting aside the administrative difficulties of the old province, I believe Partition to have been really necessary.....The diminution of the power of Bengali political agitation will assist to remove a serious cause for anxiety."[32] Referring to the Partition, Lord Hardinge, who succeeded Minto as Governor-General, also wrote to the Secretary of State, Lord Crew, on 13 July, 1911, that "the desire to aim a blow at the Bengalis overcame other considerations in giving effect to that laudable object."[33]

It is thus quite clear that the real motive behind the partition of Bengal was to weaken the influence of the Bengalis who had 'imposed an increasing burden upon the Government of Bengal' "by the spread of higher education and the advanced political aspirations that accompany it, among others."[34]

There was also the motive of placating the Muhammadans and creating a solid Muhammadan bloc against the Hindus in respect of political views. This is proved by the following extract of a letter from Herbert Risley, dated 13 September, 1904: "The boundary suggested would bring within the Eastern Province the bulk of the characteristic Muhamadans of Bengal who form 78 per cent of the population in Rajshahi, 50 per cent. in Dinajpur, and 48 per cent. in Malda. Not only would it give Dacca a central position in relation to the rest of the new Province, but it would tend, in course of time, to confer on that city the special character of provincial capital, where Muhamadan interests would be strongly represented, if not predominant."[35]

That Lord Curzon himself entertained the same opinion is

abudnantly clear from his speech at Dacca on 18 February, 1904, from which the following extract is quoted:

"Will any one here pretend that Dacca is anything but a shadow of its former self?" The proposed scheme of partition "would make Dacca the centre and possibly the capital of a new and self-sufficing province which must give to the people of these districts by reason of their numerical strength and their superior culture the preponderating voice in the province so created, which would invest the Mohammedans in Eastern Bengal with a unity which they have not enjoyed since the days of the old Musalman Viceroys and kings, and which would go far to revive the traditions which the historical students assure us once attached to the kingdom of Eastern Bengal."

The opposition to the idea of Partition, from its initial stage to the very end, was so unanimous and persistent that it has no parallel in the history of British administration. According to the Government resolution it was based merely, on sentimental grounds. But this was only partially true. It was no doubt mere sentiment that made the people loth to transfer to Dacca, "the extinct capital of a barbaric regime", the hearty homage which they had so long paid to Calcutta. There was also the fear that deep-rooted social ties of long standing among the Bengalis were likely to be sundered. But the opposition was not due to such sentiments alone. Material interests were also involved. The lawyers, newspapers, educational institutions and various other interests were likely to suffer by the division of territories, and the influence of public opinion, as a safeguard to public interests, would lose considerable strength. But these were, comparatively speaking minor matters. The principal consideration that worked in the popular mind was the destruction of the solidarity of the Bengalis, who justly regarded themselves as the most politically advanced in the whole of India, and took pride in the fact that their province was the most populous and wealthy, and their city, Calcutta, the glory of India, nay of Asia. The people of East Bengal would lose Calcutta and a truncated Bengal would be deprived of the other advantages mentioned above. Finally, in the new Province of Bengal, the Bengalis, 17 millions, would be outnumbered by the Hindi speaking population, 20

millions, to which may be added the Oriya speaking minority. Thus the Hindus of Bengal would be in a minority in both the Provinces in which their homeland was to be divided. As mentioned above, the Government were fully aware of these highly objectionable features, but looked upon them as the chief merits of the scheme.

But there was a still deeper apprehension among the Bengalis. They could not but feel that the Partition was a measure deliberately adopted to kindle rivalry and animosity between the Hindus and Muslims—the two great communities in Bengal. This was best expressed by Surendra Nath Banerji while describing the general reaction to the publication of the Government resolution on 20 July, 1905.[36]

An edge was given to this suspicion by the refusal of the Government even to consider the proposal that the redistribution of territories might be so effected as to keep all the Bengali-speaking people within the same province.

If the proposals of the Government of India were bad enough, the manner in which they were carried out was worse still.

According to Mr. C.J. O'Donnell, M.P., the measure "was forced through by a flagrant act of contempt for the House of Commons." The Secretary of State 'pledged himself that the proposal of the partition of Bengal would not be given effect to till all the papers relating to it had been laid before Parliament, and yet this pledge was broken. The whole project of the creation of the province of Eastern Bengal and Assam was hatched in secret in India and approved in secret by the Secretary of State without giving the Parliament a chance to consider it. The legislation to give effect to it was carried through at Simla at a hole and corner meeting of Lor dCurzon and the official members of the legislative council at which not a single Indian member was present."[37] Surendra Nath voiced the opinion of Bengal when he said :

"The revised scheme (of Partition) was conceived in secret, discussd in secret, and settled in secret, without the slightest hint to the public.....We felt that we had been insulted, humiliated and tricked."[38]

FOOTNSTES

1. *Hind Swaraj* (1946), pp. 15 ff.
1a. The following pamphlets may be cited as specimens:
A. *An Open Letter to Lord Curzon* (April, 1904, Dacca).
B. *All About Partition* (September, 1905, Calcutta).
2. *Nation*, p. 186.
3. Mukherjees, 30-31.
4. Bagal, 162.
5. O'Donnell, Chapter V.
6. Mazumdar, A. C., *Indian National Evolution*, p. 212.
7. O'Donnell, Ch. V.
8. This will be discussed in detail in Ch. V.
9. *Nation*, 190
10. Mukherjees, 38.
11. Ibid, p. 219, f. n., 63, and pp. 38-9.
12. Ibid, 39.
13. Ibid, 42.
14. Ibid, 58.
15. Nation, 196—7.
16. Mukherjees, 54-5.
17. Ibid, 56.
18. Ibid, 69.
19. Ibid, 67.
20. *Ibid*, 73.
21. Collected Works of Rabindranath, III. 538.
22. Cf. Vol. I (2nd Ed.), pp. 377-382.
23. *The Kayastha Samachar*, August, November, 1901. Quoted by Daniel Argov in *Moderates and Extremists in the Indian National Movement*, pp. 87-8.
24. Even some European officials did not believe that the Partition would improve the administration. Cf. A. K. Majumdar, *Advent of Independence* (pp. 31-32, 331-336) for a note of Stevens to this effect.
25. This is quoted by Mrs. Kalpana Bishui in the *Quarterly Review of Historical Studies*, Vol. V, Number 2, (pp. 78-96), along with many other documents quoted below.
26. Home Dept. Proceedings, December, 1903, Nos. 149-60.
27. Risley's Note, dated 6.12.04. Home-Public-A, Fabruary, 1905, Nos. 155-67.
28. Curzon Papers—Private Correspondence of the Viceroy with the Secretary of State, dated 17 February, 1904.
29. Curzon's Note dated 6.3.03. Home—Public—A, December, 1903, Nos. 149-60.
30. Note dated 28.3.1903.
31. The *Modern Review*, 1959, Part I, p. 297.

32. For the two letters of Minto, cf. "Memorandum on the Partition of Bengal"—an enclosure to Minto's letter to Morley dated, 5 February 1906. I am indebted for this information to an unpublished thesis by Dr. Mrs. V. Majumdar.
33. Hardinge Papers, Combridge University Library.
34. Letter from the Govenrment of India to the Secretary of State, recommending Partition of Bengal. Unpublished record CRO. Judicial & Public, 1903, No. 73 of 1903.
35. Blue Book, CD 2746, p. 203. Quoted by C. J. O'Donnell, in *The Causes of Present Discontent in India*, Ch. VI, pp 68 ff.
36. *Nation*, pp. 187-8.
37. O'Donnell, op. cit., p. 61.
38. *Nation*, pp. 186-7.

CHAPTER II.

THE SWADESHI MOVEMENT

I. GENERAL REVIEW.

Absolute callousness of the Government to public opinion against the Partition led the people of Bengal, in a spirit of sheer exasperation born out of frustration, to hit upon the device of boycotting the British goods. It was a great departure from the traditional method of Indian politics. The leaders of Bengal exhausted the armoury of constitutional agitation, known to them, namely, vocal protests in mass meetings, propaganda in the press, appeal, petitions, and conferences. The Government of India not only did not budge an inch, but steadily expanded the scope of the Partition scheme in the teeth of the unanimous voice of protest. All this proved their supreme indifference to the most cherished sentiments and deepest feelings of the people. It was then, *but not till then*[1] that the people became fully conscious of the futility of entreaty and petitions for mercy, and realized the necessity of some coercive measures which could force the Government to do justice to them. Then, out of the medley of suggestions, the one that caught the popular imagination was the boycott of British goods, and this was adopted as the national policy in a meeting in the Tow Hall at Calcutta on 7 August, 1905.

In view of the great importance which the programme of boycott occupied in the subsequent political agitations, it is necessary to recall here that the idea of using boycott as a coercive weapon for securing political or economic objects was not altogether new in India. As early as 1874 boycott was advocated as a means for reviving Indian industries, which had been ruined by the British commercial policy in India. Boycott of Manchester cloth was preached in 1875, 1876 and again in 1878 on account of the hostility of Manchester to the newly started Indian mills in Bombay. In 1883-84 when popular feelings were aroused by the agitation of the Anglo-Indians against Ilbert Bill

and the imprisonment of Surendra Nath Banerji, the boycott of British goods was ardently preached. In 1891, the boycott of British goods was preached and also practised to some extent by the opponents of the Age of Consent Bill. But none of these proposals were seriously acted upon or put into practice. At the same time it appears from the comments of the contemporary periodicals that the idea of boycott was also partly inspired by foreign examples. Thus the *Barisal Hitaishi* (19.7.05) wrote : "Will the Bengalis be able to imitate the Chinese in the boycott of foreign goods ? If they can, the path is clear before them."[2]

The original conception of boycott was mainly an economic one. It had two distinct, but allied, purposes in view. The first was to bring pressure upon the British public by the pecuniary loss they would suffer by the boycott of British goods, particularly the Manchester cotton goods for which Bengal provided the richest market in India. Secondly, it was regarded as essential for the revival of indigenous (*swadeshi*) industry which, being at its infant stage, could never grow in the face of free competition with foreign countries which had a highly developed industry. As has been noted above, far from helping the nascent Indian industry by protective duty, the British pursued the free trade policy with a vengeance and, at the pressure of Manchester, did not hesitate even to impose excise duty on cotton goods manufactured in India in order to cripple the Indian cotton mills. It was therefore felt that the Indian industry could stand on its own legs only if the foreign goods were deliberately shut out by the policy of boycott. Further, boycott movement could not possibly succeed unless the essential goods, hitherto imported from foreign countries, could be produced in India. If, for example, sufficient cloths were not produced in India, people would be forced to buy Manchester goods, and the boycott was bound to fail. Thus the two proposals, namely, refusal to buy foreign goods and the promotion of indigeneous industry, were indissolubly bound up together. The first was known as Boycott and the second as *Swadeshi* movement—but these were merely two facets of the same stone. The Boycott was the negative, and *Swadeshi*, the positive aspect of the same idea.

Like the Boycott, the *Swadeshi*, as a purely economic

measure for the growth of Indian industry, was not an altogether novel idea in India. As mentioned above, it was preached by several eminent personalities in the 19th century. Thus Gopal Hari Deshmukh, better known as Lokahitawadi, of Bombay, urged, about the middle of the century, the necessity of using indigenous goods and suggested that a regular movement should be started to preach this idea. But far more comprehensive was the scheme of Bholanath Chandra, published as far back as 1873. Bholanath Chandra observed that the condition of Indian manufactures was never treated of in any native Magazine, and took the Indian-managed Press to task for neglecting this important public question. He wrote: "The Native English and vernacular papers should preach for the founding of independent Native Banks, Native Companies and Corporations, Native Mills and Factories, and Native Chambers of Commerce in the Presidencies. They should denounce the insensate practice of preferring foreign goods to home-made manufactures. They should inculcate the discipline of self-denial, and the cultivation of patriotic sentiments. They should collect and compile details of Indian urban life to draw public attention to the helpless condition of our weavers, blacksmiths and mechanics. They should point out the enormous and unceasing drain upon the profits of Indian labour, to show that the country is growing poorer year by year, and thoroughly expose the statistical delusion of the authorities. They should sedulously strive for the subversion of the policy, which, in addition to our political slavery, has steeped the country also in an industrial slavery." He went to the extreme length of denouncing foreign capital for the development of Indian industries. He wrote : "I want no foreign capital to resort to India ; her own capital should be created. I want no foreign imports which she can manufacture herself at home."[3]

Others, including Swami Dayananda, emphasized the need of using indigenous goods. A more practical shape was given to the idea by Jogendra Chandra Ghosh of Calcutta. He rightly perceived that home manufacture required a large number of Indians trained in higher branches of science and technology. Such training was not available in India and there were serious obstacles, mainly social and economic, in the way of Indian

students proceeding to foreign countries. In order to remove this difficulty J. C. Ghosh offered a large number of scholarships, for many years, to such students. As a pioneer scheme its success must be regarded as very great indeed. It enabled more than four hundred Indian young men to receive foreign training, some of whom started new industries, totalling more than twenty.

But the seeds sown by these people did not germinate till the soil was rendered fertile by the grim resolve of a united people, exasperated beyond measure, to forge the twin weapons of Boycott and *Swadeshi*, in order to undo the great wrong which was inflicted upon them by an arrogant Government callous to the voice of the people. Thus although the ideas of Boycott and *Swadeshi* were not entirely novel, they got a new meaning and a new impetus in 1905, because they were now instrumental in the fight for a common cause which rallied fifty million Bengalis under the leadership of persons, inspired by the new national sentiments whose origin has been traced above.

The influence of nationalism is clearly seen in the rapid extension of the original concepts of Boycott and *Swadeshi*, and of the purposes underlying them. The idea of economic boycott as a weapon to coerce the British to undo the Partition gradually receded into the background. It developed into an idea of non-coperation with the British in every field, and the object aimed at was a political regeneration of the country, with the distant goal of absolute freedom looming large before the eyes of the more advanced section.

Similarly, *Swadeshi* completely outgrew the original conception of promoting Indian industry. It assumed a new form based upon the literal connotation of the word *Swadeshi*, namely attachment to everything Indian. This development was undoubtedly the result of the newly awakened patriotism and nationalism which had been slowly gathering force during the 19th century.

Nevertheless, it is necessary to point out that such a phenomenal development of the ideas of Boycott and *Swadeshi* was brought about by the repressive measures which were adopted by the Government to put down the Boycott movement, formally inauguranted on 7 August, 1905, a red-letter day in the

annals of the struggle for India's freedom. The fight which began on that day never ceased until the British sheathed their sword and granted freedom to India on 15 August, 1947. The history of these forty-two years centres round the twofold aspects of the *Swadeshi* movement—Boycott and *Swadeshi*—in one form or another. As Will Durant has justly observed: "It was in 1905, then, that the Indian Revolution began."[3a] Beginning as a tiny brook, it was gradually swelled by affluents and tributaries till it developed into a mighty torrent whose onward rush swept away everything before it. The beginning of the *Swadeshi* movement marked the end of *Pax Britannica* and ushered in a period of stress and storm, of terrorism and violence, on both sides, till this unequal fight between the giant and the dwarf was decided, to a very large extent, by unforeseen world events, which changed the political map of the world. The terrible oppression of the British and its reaction upon the people form, therefore, an integral part of the *Swadeshi* movement.

II. THE ECONOMIC BOYCOTT AND SWADESHI.

1. The Supply.

The beginnings of the first phase of the Boycott and *Swadeshi* movement have been discussed in the preceding chapter. Though Manchester cloth was the chief target of attack, the movement was extended to other British manufactures also, such as salt and sugar, as well as luxury goods in general. The rock-salt, found in India, and country-made sugar and *gur* were in great demand ; but the greatest headache was caused by the question of cloth, for as matters then stood, the demand considerably exceeded the indigenous supply. But the mill-owners of Bombay and Ahmadabad came to the rescue. The Boycott movement in Bengal supplied a momentum and driving force to the cotton mills in India, and the opportunity thus presented was liberally exploited by the mill-owners.[4]

It was complained at the time that the Bombay mill-owners made a huge profit at the expense of what they regarded as "Bengali sentimentalism" for buying indigenous cloth at any sacrifice. There may be some truth in it, for it is idle to expect that all the Bombay mill-owners in 1905-6 were so much inspired

by patriotic and nationalist sentiments as to forego the material interests which chance threw in their way. But whether the motives for largely increasing their supply were noble and patriotic, or selfish and sordid, there is no question that by doing so they played a valuable role in sustaining the *Swadeshi* movement. It was well understood, both by the people and the Government, that a successful boycott of Manchester cloth alone could hit the British hard, and the success of this boycott depended upon the supply from Bombay.

Attempts were made by Bengali leaders to set up textile mills in Bengal. But something more than mere patriotic sentiments and national ardour is required for the success of such industrial enterprises ;—they cannot be brought into fruition in sufficient number at a short notice, particularly by a people who had no industrial bent of mind, and in a region which possessed no textile mills. Although one or two mills were started, they somehow maintained a precarious existence, and did not materially contribute to the solution of the problem. More than twenty years were to elapse before the textile industry in Bengal could forge ahead and produce a substantial portion of Bengal's requirements.

For the time being, Bengal had to supplement the supply from Bombay mills by the coarse productions of handlooms. The weaving industry in Bengal was a very flourishing one till the British ruined it after they established their rule over the Province in the eighteenth century. The Boycott movement seemed to be a suitable opportunity for reviving that industry. The cloths produced were very coarse, but were accepted by the Bengalis in the true spirit of the *Swadeshi* movement. A song which became very popular all over the country urged upon the people 'to give the place of honour (*lit.* put on the head) to the coarse cloth which is the gift of the Mother, who was too poor to offer a better one.'

Next to the problem of supply was that of distribution. In the towns the difficulty was solved by the establishment of *Swadeshi* stores, i.e., shops which made it a point to keep a good stock of indigenous goods. Such stores rapidly multiplied, of themselves, owing to the ever-increasing demand for indigenous goods, even when they were more costly than foreign goods of

better quality Messrs. K. B. Sen and Co., which dealt with indigenous goods, "sold off the whole of their Puja stock in course of the first two weeks of August, which, in the ordinary course of business, would have taken them eight months to dispose of".[5]

But other difficulties soon cropped up. The "demand for *Swadeshi* cloths and the paucity of their supply encouraged a good many shop-keepers to charge almost an exorbitant price for the *Swadeshi* articles."[6] This was bound to kill the *Swadeshi* movement sooner or later. So the Anti-Circular Society, whose origin will be described later, "undertook the voluntary responsibility of ensuring an easy supply of the *Swadeshi* articles, specially cloths, to the people at cost price. The Supply Committee was soon organized. Volunteers were recruited and the *Swadeshi* goods began to be sold by them at cost price from door to door in the city. Even in the *mofussil* areas its activities spread, and fair price shops of the *Swadeshi* goods were started by the Society. The purchasers in every place were warned of fraudulent hawkers and were asked to take note of the Anti-Circular Society label attached to each one of its articles before actual purchase was made. Within a fortnight after its inception, the activities of the Supply Committee began to achieve great success. Altogether the members of the Anti-Circular Society served in those days as ever-vigilant guards and custodians of the *Swadeshi* movement."[7]

There was, however, considerable difficulty in making the indigenous goods available in the remote country-sides. Some villages had periodical markets, called *hats*, usually thrice a week, which served a large number of neighbouring villages as well. Arrangements were made for selling indigenous goods in these markets. But these were mostly private properties, usually belonging to local landlords, who had absolute control over them. It was sometimes complained that the landlords, at the instigation of the Government, refused permission to the sale of indigenous goods ; but the Government also, not unoften, brought charge against the disloyal *Zamindars*, that they encouraged the sale of indigenous goods by arbitrary means. There was consequently a great deal of friction leading occasionally to serious disturbances, as will be noted later.

In addition to supply through shops and village-markets there was regular organization of national volunteers who were ready to supply needy villagers with their requirements of indigenous goods, even though they had to carry them on their shoulders from a distance of several miles. It was a common sight for the rural people that volunteers moved round the village houses to make a list of the cloths, salt, and sugar required by them, and then, having bought them at different centres, carried them to the individual householders. Students from schools and colleges readily undertook to do this duty during vacations, and thus served the classes of people with many of whom they had hardly any social intercourse before the *Swadeshi* movement. The barriers created by birth and wealth were also considerably removed by other adjuncts of the movement such as the *Rakhi-bandhan*, inaugurated by poet Rabindra Nath, as mentioned above.[8] For the ceremony was observed every year on 16 October, when all the people of the village, irrespective of age, walth, or social status, tied on one another's wrists the coloured piece of thread, which was symbolical of fraternal tie.

2. The Method

The great problem of the leaders was how to make the Boycott successful. Numerous meetings were held all over the country, in which the boycott was preached and the assembled people took solemn vows or pledges to eschew foreign goods, and buy indigenous goods alone.

A large number of *Samitis* (Societies), the majority of the members of which were students, were formed in Calcutta and all over Bengal for pushing on the Boycott movement.

The sort of propaganda that was carried on by the leaders of the *Swadeshi* movement may be judged from an appeal issued to the people of Barisal over the signature of Aswini Kumar Datta and other leaders. Its main ideas may be summed up as follows :—

(i) Our *Swadeshi* cloths would "ultimately sell cheaper" than foreign cloths.

(ii) The cloth we now wear was, after all, "made of our cotton and jute."

(iii) "These raw materials are now carried in ships to England, where English coolies and skilled labourers are employed to make cloth out of them, and the finished product has again to be carried back to this country in ships. If the raw materials are used in our own country it will mean a saving to us at least equivalent to the double shipping involved in the other process."

(iv) Indigenous cloth production would mean "employment" for our "coolies and skilled labourers."

(v) Only observe patience for a while.

(vi) There was no legal bar in the way of our purchases of indigenous goods instead of foreign products.

(vii) We must be very particular to keep the vow of *Swadeshi* unflagging, or the little glory we have already had would be extinguished for ever.

(viii) "Only we must see to it that in making people take this vow none may exercise force and violence nor in any other way may violate the existing law. Our duty is not to force, but to persuade people on our knees."

(ix) "There is, however, one thing we may do. If there are men who refuse to listen to the voice of reason and are determined to act against the wishes and sentiments of all their neighbours, there is nothing to prevent us from excommunicating them."

(x) "To fulfil this and other objects and for the good of our motherland, there should be a people's association in each village."[9]

Earnest attempts were made to enlist the sympathy and support of all classes of people. A confidential official Report refers to attempts made by the leaders of Faridpur and Barisal to enlist the sympathies of the lower classes (*Namasudras*) to the Boycott-Swadeshi movement. As a matter of fact the movement was very broad-based : "Not to speak of the participation of Zemindars and pleaders, students and youths, peasants and shop-keepers, even medical men and native army, Brahmins and priests, barbers and washermen, played an important part in the extension of the Boycott-Swadeshi movement. It is reported that on the refusal by three regiments of sepoys at Barrack-

pore and Fort William to wear uniform made of foreign cloth, they were disarmed and sent off to distant military stations in North-West India. Again, at a washermen's meeting at Boalia, the participants took the solemn vow of not washing foreign cloths on pain of excommunication. Even Brahmins and priests refused to perform Pujahs and ceremonies in which offerings were not made of indigenous articles. In some places the dissidents were even excommunicated from the caste. Moreover, the Government also noticed how the secret connivance of the native police fostered the Boycott-Swadeshi cause."[10]

The religious sentiments of the people were regularly exploited. "Bengali vernaclar papers like the *Sandhya* and the *Bangavashi* began to preach that by using Liverpool salt foreign sugar, which were refined by the use of blood and bones of swine and cows, the people would run the risk of losing their *Dharma*. The Pandits of Nawadwip and Bhatpara also lent their support to the movement and sent out two of their members as *Swadeshi* missionaries. In the Nadia district the family priests carried the Boycott from door to door. In the district of Jesore also this feature was manifest"[11] Reference has already been made to the grand *Puja* and *Homa* ceremony at the Kalighat temple followed by the solemn vow to use *Swadeshi* and boycott foreign goods.[12] Surendra Nath describes in his autobiography how the idea of taking *Swadeshi* vow before a deity struck him while he was addressing a *Swadeshi* meeting held in the courtyard of a Hindu temple, with the image of the God right in front of him. "As I spoke and had my eyes fixed upon the temple and the image, and my mind was full of the associations of the place, in a moment of sudden impulse I appealed to the audience to stand up and to take a solemn vow in the presence of the god of their worship. I administered the vow, and the whole audience, standing, repeated the words after me. The words were in Bengalee and the speech was in Bengalee ; the vow may be translated as follows :

'Invoking God Almighty to be our Witness, and standing in the presence of after-generations, we take this solemn vow that, so far as practicable, we shall use home-made articles and abstain from the use of foreign articles. So help us God.'

"I had never before thought of this vow. It was a sudden

inspiration prompted by the surroundings of the place ; and the effect may be better imagined than described, when a vast audience of, say, ten or fifteen thousand people rose up with one impulse, and repeated in one voice the solemn words of the vow. For a time our critics said nothing ; but soon the profound impression it created became apparent, and they thundered forth their anathemas. We noted them, but heeded them not, and pursued the even tenor of our ways."[13]

"At Baidayabati a meeting was held in the temple of Kali before whom solemn pledges were taken to make the movement a success, each contributing his quota according to his mite."[14]

"Similar reports regarding the working up of religious passions for political purposes came also from Birbhum where in a leaflet the following appeal was made :

"Bande Mataram

'Sir, you are the son of a Hindu, and are in the habit of worshipping Gods and Brahmins. Our humble request is that you should not use sugar and salt, refined with the blood and bones of cows and pigs, in worshipping Gods and offering oblations to your forefathers. This is the injunction of the Shastras. We are sons of Hindus and should not disregard Shastras.'-(Sd. An Indian)."[15]

The ideas of *Swadeshi* and Boycott were kept alive and brought home to every door by articles in newspapers, processions, popular songs, enrolment of volunteers to keep vigilant watch, and by occasional bonfires of foreign cloths, salt, and sugar. The old apparels of foreign make, belonging to sundry people, were placed in a heap and then it was set on fire. The blazing flames were greeted with shouts of *Bande Mataram*, Such bonfires were looked upon as a special mode of honouring noted public leaders when they visited any particular locality. Such tours of eminent leaders and the bonfires greeting them were regarded as of great value as a means of infusing enthusiasm for *Swadeshi*.

There was undoubtedly great enthusiasm, and many people required no persuasion to buy *Swadeshi* goods in exclusion of the foreign. But it would be idle to pretend that all persons followed such a high ideal which imposed a great deal of sacrifice in money and comfort. Poor and ignorant villagers, and

many others besides, would be hard put to it, to continue to buy, for an indefinite period, indigenous cloth, biscuit, sugar, or salt, when they could easily get the same articles of much better quality at a considerably lower price. The temptation of buying British goods was too great and many succumbed to it.

Various methods were adopted to ensure success of the Boycott against this danger. Some of these have been mentioned above.[16] The following incidents referred to in Police Reports may be regarded as illustrative.

Bankura confectioners declared a fine of Rs. 100/- to be inflicted on anyone found using foreign sugar. At Birbhum the foreign cigerettes at Suri Bazar were bought up and burnt in the streets, and it was decided at a meeting of the Bahmins to refuse to assist any religious ceremonies in houses where European salt and sugar were used. At Dinajpur, doctors, pleaders and *mukhtears* threatened the Marwaris that if they imported foreign articles they would refuse to work for them.

The movement spread to the peasant classes, both Hindu and Muslims. At Jalpaiguri, some students made a bonfire of cigarettes, cricket bats, footballs, clothes, etc., and an effigy of Lord Curzon was also burnt in fire.

But these methods did not prove sufficient for the purpose. So the shops selling foreign goods were picketted by national volunteers. This was the beginning of that system of 'peaceful picketing' which was destined to become a normal feature in almost all types of political agitation in future.

The normal procedure of picketting may be described somewhat as follows : A small band of young men, mostly students, would stand close to the shops where foreign goods were sold. They would approach with folded hands anyone going towards these shops, and try to persuade him not to buy foreign goods. If any one were found coming out of these shops with foreign goods, they would request him to return them and get the price back. If the person were willing but the shop-keeper refused to refund the price, the volunteers would in some cases pay the price themselves, and make a bonfire of the foreign article, as an erample to others.

To anyone acquainted with human nature it should be evident that the procedure was liable to grave abuses. Some

hot-headed young men would not remain quiet if the intending or actual purchaser of foreign goods turned down their request, or the shop-keepers refused to take back the foreign goods already sold. In some cases, there were altercations, and high words were exchanged ; and perhaps in a few cases they led to abuses or even assaults. This would give the police a good opportunity to interfere. The volunteers were roughly handled, and if they resisted, the police beat them with *lathis*. The Police *lathi*, which acquired notoriety in the history of Indian struggle for freedom, was a long and stout stick, made of seasoned bamboo, and shod at the lower end with iron tip. Hard blows of a *lathi* were enough to cause bleeding wounds, fracture of bones and skulls, and even death, depending upon the manner of striking and the particular part of the body struck. These 'Regulation *lathis*', as they were called, were freely used by the pilice to drive away the picketters and to disperse crowds, whether riotous or peaceful, if they were supposed to be sympathetic to the picketting volunteers. The uttering of *Bande Mataram* was an indisputable evidence of such sympathy, and later it was made illegal to shout it.

A "mild *lathi* charge", the official phrase used to describe the assault of the police, was a misnomer. It was certainly not mild, as the gaping wounds on the bodies loudly proclaimed. But sometimes even these *lathi* charges failed to stop the picketing. Then the police took to the nearest police station a number of persons—whether actual picketers, sympathisers, or mere passers-by—and regular cases were instituted against them for obstructing, abusing or assaulting peaceful citizens engaged in buying or selling foreign goods. These 'citizens' found no difficulty in identifying a dozen or more arrested persons, most of whom he had probably never seen at the time of occurrence. Many would probably regard it as a wonderful feat for a person to be able to identify a dozen of men whom he could at best notice for a few minutes in a tense situation. But the explanation is simple. The arrested persons were kept in the police lock-up, and the 'citizens', whose 'honesty' and 'loyalty' were proved by their partiality for foreign goods, were secretly taken to the police stations more than once to look at the accused persons, so that they could identify them in court.

The trying Magistrates would not hesitate to convict the accused on such evidence. Most of the Judges were Indians, and knew the true state of things, but they knew also that 'no conviction' in such cases meant 'no promotion', and in many cases degradation or other kinds of punishment on various pretexts.

It must not be supposed, however, that the police interfered only in cases where there was an actual friction between the picketers and the purchasers or shop-keepers. Many over-zealous 'officers, alarmed at the rapid decline of the sale of foreign goods within their jurisdiction—the surest evidence of incompetence and disloyalty in the eyes of the British Magistrates and higher officials,—wanted to terrorize the people by *lathi*-charges and criminal prosecutions, on the slightest pretext, or even without any pretext, on a got-up charge.

The Government, however, did not depend on these measures alone, but sought to strike at the very root of the matter. As the students supplied the bulk of the volunteers and picketers, the Government issued circulars and instructions to the educational institutions asking them to control their boys and prevent them from participating in the *Swadeshi* movement in any way. This topic will be dealt with in a separate section. It will suffice here to state that students were punished both by the institutions to which they belonged as well as by the police. Indiscriminate assaults were made by the latter on students and respectable persons. Cases were instituted against students, and many of them were rusticated or fined. According to a contemporary report "the chief part of the official wrath against *Swadeshi* is vented on the students. They are harassed, persecuted and oppressed for their advocacy of the country's cause. They are being flogged, fined, imprisoned, expelled from schools and colleges, and even rusticated from the universities."

The second method was to control the rural markets by influencing the local landlords or *Zamindars* who owned them. These had large interests at stake and could ignore the directions, implied or explicit, of the Government only at their peril. They were asked by the Government to see that the sale of foreign goods was not obstructed in any way. This meant, in plain language, that picketers must not be allowed to attend the markets, and any encouragement to the sale of indigenous

goods at the cost of foreign ones must be forcibly stopped. A careful record was kept of the sale of foreign goods in these markets, and a steady decline of such sale in any market was believed to be due to encouragement by the *Zamindars*, or at least his negligence to take proper steps to prevent such a catastrophe. This may be illustrated by a concrete instance. Sri Brajendra Kishore Roy Choudhury of Gouripore (Mymensingh) was one of the biggest *Zamindars* of East Bengal. The *Swadeshi* movement flourished very much in certain areas included in his *Zamindari*. The Government possessed no evidence that he encouraged the *Swadeshi* movement. But the District Magistrate of Mymensingh 'suspected' him to be a 'strong supporter of *Swadeshi*'. So he wrote several strong notes to the Government of East Bengal, requesting it to "inflict exemplary punishment on this Zamindar by confiscating his lands."[17]

The third method adopted by the Government was to set the loyal Muslim against the recalcitrant Hindus which will be discussed in detail later.

The fourth method was to ban the processions and meetings, and curb the newspapers by rigorous press laws. For it was rightly thought that the spirit of *Swadeshi* movement was sustained by propaganda carried in the press and on the platform.

The fifth and the last method devised by the Government was deportation. It meant the confinement of the leaders of the movement, without any trial, for an indefinite period.

The adoption of these methods, particuarly the last two, was based on the assumption that the *Swadeshi* movement was really kept going by a few designing persons, while the people as a whole were loyal, and either averse or indifferent to it. All that was necessary, therefore, to scotch or kill the movement was to keep the people free from the pernicious influences of the mischievous leaders. If the leaders can be kept confined at a safe distance, and their views cannot be disseminated through newspapers or public meetings, the *Swadeshi* movement would die a natural death. That it did not, merely proves that the basic assumption of the Government was wrong. The *Swadeshi* movement was not an exotic plant artificially reared up by a

few designing persons. As its name implies, it was an indigenous tree with its roots in the soil of Bengal.

The supporters' of the *Swadeshi* movement also had weapons, other than those mentioned above, in their armoury. If they were less offensive, they were not always less effective.

As repression increased, a four-fold programme of Boycott was preached :

1. Abjuring of English cloth, salt, sugar, etc.
2. Abjuring of English speech.
3. Resignation of honorary offices under Government and seats in Councils.
4. Social boycott against persons purchasing foreign articles which was to take the following forms :

a. None shall eat and drink with them.
b. None shall intermarry with them.
c. None shall buy from, or sell to, them.
d. Depriving them of the service of barbers.
e. Boys and girls should be instructed not to play with their children

The social excommunication was included in the proclamation issued at Barisal. Bepin Chandra Pal, speaking in a Calcutta meeting on 7 August, advocated the social ostracism of those who were anti-*Swadeshi*. "Following Bipin Chandra Pal's inflammatory speeches at Dacca in September, 1906, the *pandits* assembled at a meeting on September 17, 1906, and signed a document, expressing their determination to excommunicate those persons who would use foreign articles."

The social boycott was a very powerful weapon. A man selling or buying foreign goods, or in any way opposing *Swadeshi* movement and helping Government in putting it down, would be subjected to various degrees of humiliation. People would not talk to him, jeer at him from a distance, and his children would be hooted and hissed in schools and playgrounds. His relatives or neighbours would not attend his social ceremonies ; his priests, physicians, servants, washermen and barbers would refuse to serve him ; and there are even instances where the marriage of his sons and daughters was rendered difficult, if not impossible. Such social ostracism would make a

man quite unhappy, sometimes even very miserable, and the Government could do very little to help him in his distress.

Nevinson describes how, late one night, five or six merchants secretly approached him. They had a large store of Manchester piece-goods of many thousand pounds worth, "laid up in their warehouses ; and, in consequence, they were shunned by their kind. Barbers would not shave them, milkmen would not bring them milk, friends would not come to their daughters' marriages, acquaintances would not say good-morning. Such treatment was distressing and inconvenient. Would I please use my influence with the Home Government, and set everything right again ? They refused to throw in their lot with the *Swadeshi* movement ; their goods were too valuable to be sacrificed, and they preferred to stand and die as martyrs in the cause of British commerce."[18]

But such non-violence ostracism was not the only form of persecution. Sometimes the 'renegade' would suffer material loss and bodily or mental pain. His house would accidentally (?) catch fire at night; he would be struck from behind while walking in darkness ; and slanders, deliberately spread about the female members of his family, would find ready credence. In *Mofussil* towns even the wives of Government officials—particularly those of the police, executive, and judicial branches who were guilty of maltreating the national volunteers, pickeers or other supporters of *Swadeshi* movement—would meet with a cold reception in 'ladies' societies, though spared of further humiliation on account of the status of their husbands.

This general picture is based on concrete instances established by reliable testimony, such as the records of the time and personal evidence of contemporaries. Reference may also be made to the Government version. On 5 October, 1909, Mr. Keir Hardie asked the Secretary of State for India if he had any information to show that intimidation had been practised in connection with the Boycott movement.

The result of enquiries, instituted in this connection by the Government of India, may be tabulated as follows, under three distinct categories of crime, the figures including cases both 'actual' and 'threatened.'

Nature of Crime	*Bengal*	*East Bengal & Assam.*
1. Social ostracism	41	39
2. Assault, injury, or mischief	109	172
3. Arson.	75	9

An examination of the list of cases furnished by the two Governments gives an insight into the nature of the agitation. The list from Bengal contains 93 entries for the period 1906-09, that of East Bengal, 559, during 1905-09. Most of the cases are connected with the snatching away of foreign cloths and burning them, and throwing away Liverpool salt and sweets made of foreign sugar. There are, however, many cases on record in which the picketers seized the foreign cloths and burnt them, but paid the price of the cloth to the owner. Anonymous letters were sent to traders in foreign commodities, and if the warning went unheeded, sometimes fire was set to their establishments.

Prosecutions were actually instituted only in ten cases by the Government of Bengal and 105 cases in East Bengal. Only half of the prosecutions ended in conviction, the punishment usually awarded being imprisonment for periods varying from one year to two weeks. In some cases the accused were required to furnish securities.

The failure of a large number of prosecutions and non-institution of proceedings are said to be due to want of evidence, for few would choose or dare testify against persons accused of *Swadeshi* cases.

Several cases of social ostracism are reported, only by way of illustration. The most notable was that of the Sahas of Barisal. In spite of the remonstrances of the *Swadeshi* party of Barisal, these Sahas were selling foreign cloth. So the *Swadeshiwallas* sent some volunteers to the native village of the Sahas (Shamsiddhi, Dt. Dacca). These volunteers, with the help of local recruits, succeeded in preventing many of their guests from attending a "*mahotshab*" ceremony organised by the Sahas in their native village. In Barisal itself all the native doctors, barbers and washermen etc., were induced to boycott the merchants, and they were jeered at and insulted in the streets. In 1907 a consignment of foreign goods belonging to these Shahas

was destroyed by means of nitric acid injected into the bales by a syringe.

A case is reported from Nadia in which Chandra Kanta Pal used foreign sugar and was boycotted by his castemen, priest and barber. One Krishto Napit, who privately shaved him, was taken to task for it and beaten by his brother-in-law.

The known facts, therefore, do not support the current notion that the faults were all on the side of the Government. That the repressive measures such as *lathi*-charge, criminal prosecutions and conviction on insufficient testimony, harassing of people on suspicion, persecution of students and sometimes even of their guardians, specially if they happened to be Government servants, and many others adopted by the Government were in many, perhaps most, cases unjust and illegal, as we ordinarily understand these two terms, admits of no doubt. But it would be equally wrong to suppose that there was no provocation on the other side, and that the picketers were always peaceful and inoffensive and did not interfere in any way with the free choice and judgment of the people as regards buying and selling foreign goods. Further, it would be idle to pretend that the success achieved by the Boycott and *Swadeshi* was solely due to a spontaneous movement on the part of the people without any artificial prop to support it.

The real state of things can best be described as an incipient rebellion—an undeclared war between the Government and the people. Each side fought with the weapons it possessed—an imperialistic and autocratic Government making full use of its organized civil and, as need arose, military forces, while the unarmed, or rather disarmed, people fought with the only weapon they could command, namely, a sort of organized Passive Resistance. Psychical force was pitted up against the physical force.

It is in this conception of an undeclared war that one finds the key to subsequent developments. In the first place, it led to the wider conception of *Swadeshi*. In revolutions men live fast, and ideas, which grow in the course of a year, would have taken a century or more in normal times. Further, one does not engage in a war for a small stake. As soon as one party realizes that a state of war exists, he naturally puts his objectives on a much higher level. This is how and why the narrow and limited

objectives, for which Boycott and *Swadeshi* were started, slowly receded into the background, yielding place to a much higher goal, and the two movements gradually merged themselves into a wide all-India national struggle for freedom.

Secondly, it is the war-spirit that explains the sudden release of pent-up or latent energy and enthusiasm of the people that led to the political reawakening and development of patriotism and national consciousness. All these suddenly blazed into flame, as it were, and found expression in a wonderful literary outburst,—in novels, stories, poems, songs and dramas.

Thirdly, as soon as the idea went home that the people were in a state of war against the Government, it occurred to many that such an unequal fight between armed force on the one side and mere passive resistance on the other could not go on for long, and its ultimate result could never be in doubt. Out of such ideas arose a faction which resolved to meet force by force. But as the people had no means of openly securing arms, they had to work in secret. This is the genesis of the sudden emergence of a network of secret revolutionary organizations which were determined to meet the Government on equal terms, by collecting arms and opposing terrorism by terrorism.

Fourthly, the idea of the war between the Government and the people in Bengal caught the imagination of the rest of India. People who were not likely to be much disturbed by the grievances of the Bengalis over the partition of their province, were sure to be seriously affected by the spectacle of a Province waging, single-handed, a bitter fight against the mighty British Government. All the latent spirit of discontent and disaffection and the newly awakened sense of nationalism and patriotism would be spurred to activity to make a common cause and a common endeavour to free their motherland. The sound of war-drums generates a spirit which makes the people shake off lethargy and rush to the battlefield on a sudden impulse—a spirit that otherwise might have lain dormant for years.

Reference may be made in this connection to observations made by Mr. Stinton, a senior Government official, towards the end of 1907, while discussing the political agitation in Kishorgunj in the District of Mymensingh, in a confidential report :

"To sum up. During the last two years disaffection has

been steadily spreading throughout the whole middle class of educated and semi-educated Hindus. The outbursts which marked the earlier period, immediately after the Partition, have ceased. Prompt punishment and drastic preventive measures have been successful in keeping a show of calm. Under the surface, however, the feelings of resentment and hatred are far more general now than two years ago. The agitation has changed in character and scope. At first it was directed entirely against the Partition. Gradually the scope has extended. Condemnation of a particular measure grew into execration of all Government measures. The movement revealed its innately seditious character.

"The result is that the possibilities of "Swaraj" in its extremest sense are freely debated. The ultimate appeal to force is lightly discussed by people who have never seen a blow struck in anger, and *political assassination* is in the mouths of schoolboys."[19]

III. THE EFFECT OF BOYCOTT.

It is difficult to form an accurate estimate of the effect of the Boycott movement on the import of foreign goods in Bengal. No exact statistics is available in respect of cotton goods, shoes, and cigarettes, to which the boycott was mainly confined at the beginning, sugar being added at a somewhat later period. We have to rely mainly upon reports in contemporary periodicals and confidential official reports so far as they are available.

As could be easily imagined, the reports in periodicals varied according to the attitude of its controlling agency towards the *Swadeshi* movement. As a rule, Indian-owned newspapers exaggerated, and the Anglo-Indian Press minimized, the effect of *Swadeshi*. The latter ridiculed it as "a huge mistake", and thought (rather hoped) that it would disappear as a "nine days' wonder." The *Englishman* of Calcutta, which had all along condemned the Partition, changed its opinion since early September, 1905, and started a regular campaign of calumny against the *Swadeshi* movement, ridiculing it as already dead and gone, but asking the Government at the same time to take drastic steps to suppress the agitation. The *Indian Daily News* of Calcutta also

wrote about the same time that "on all sides there is evidence that the *Swadeshi* movement is rapidly disappearing." The views and reports published in the *Statesman* of Calcutta gave quite a different story. The reports of its representatives regarding the sale of cotton goods may be partially quoted as they seem to give a realistic picture of great value for the starting period of the Movement.

"One very big merchant told our representative that he might then and there take away all his stock of impported goods at invoice prices, plus duty. He said that he had no sale for them and his anxiety regarding goods which would be delivered in Calcutta in the course of the ensuing months, might almost be described as pitiful. *Dhotis*, he said, could be sold only at a reduction and in very small quantities. For Manchester *dhotis*, there was practically no demand. He showed a pair of foreign *dhotis* of coarse texture which had been imported for him and for which under normal circumstances he could obtain Rs. 1-5. Then taking a pair of country-made articles, of practically the same quality, he said that whilst for the former there is no demand, he could sell as many of the latter as he could get at Rs. 1-14 a pair. Referring to his books he said his turnover in the moth preceding the last 'Durga Puja' was approximately Rs. 1,50,000 ; from present indications he doubted whether this month his sales would approach even half that amount". The *Statesman* in the same issue also referred to a second large dealer who told its representative : "The bazar is bad. Nobody wants to buy English clothing." He also told the *Statesman's* reporter that in the first half of September, 1904, he had sold 5000 bales of stuff, but in the first two weeks of that month in 1905 he had only succeeded in clearing 125 bales, and even that at reduced prices. "A third merchant", wrote the *Statesman* by mid-September, 1905, "showed our representative some six or seven telegrams and these were all in similar terms. They hailed from Barisal, Dacca Serajgunge and Dinajpur. In three cases they cancelled orders through the post... One (bepari) from Dacca said that a committee formed in that city had told the dealers there that if they bought English goods, they would do so at great risk. This man in past years has purchased white goods to the value of Rs. 40,000 ; on this occa-

sion he is despatching a consignment worth Rs. 10,000, and that only with much fear and trembling." A short table, published in the *Statesman*, showing how the sale and purchase of British cloths stored in the *mofussil* towns in September, 1905, compared with the previous year, is given below :

District.	Value of goods purchased in September, 1904	Value of goods being purchased in September, 1905.
Jessore	Rs. 30,000	Rs. 2,000
Bogra	,, 1,700	,, 200
Dacca	,, 5,000	,, 2,000
Arrah	,, 1,500	,, 200
Hazaribagh	,, 10,000	,, 500
Nadia	,, 15,000	,, 2,500
Malda	,, 8,000	,, 1,300
Burdwan	,, 6,000	,, 1,000

"The *Statesman's* local enquiries with the salt merchants of Hatkhola, Sobha Bazar Street, Calcutta, revealed even a worse picture for British salt in Bengal in September, 1905. Enquiries with the Marwari and Mohamedan 'merchants in Colootolla and Canning Street also revealed the startling fall in the sale of British-made cigarettes and tobaccos. In other lines such as soap, cheap perfumeries, buttons and some other small wares, the picture was as dark for British import as in other items". "Boot-sellers and tailors," reportd the *Statesman*, "all had, more or less, the same story to tell, and distress and depression for loss of trade has now apparently extended to all parts of the city to which Bengalis go for their business.....Enterprising dealers who, a few month ago, proudly flaunted their sign-boards that "English goods are sold here", have substituted flaming hangers asserting that Swadeshi wares alone are to be purchased within. For the moment very few shops venture to display the old time contempt for indigenous goods. The 'Market Reports' of the *Capital* of that time also revealed the same gloomy picture for British manufacturers in Calcutta.".[20]

Some newspapers in Britain also contained alarming reports. "From a report of the *London Evening News* of early October, 1905, we come to know the exact nature of the dread-

ful reaction that the Boycott movement of Bengal produced on British import cargo. Telegrams from Bengal, cancelling all previous orders for supply of British articles, cotton and woolen goods, shoes and other things, were daily reaching England".[21] As a matter of fact, the Marwaris who were the chief importers of foreign cloth, clearly anticipated this state of things. On September 1, 1905, the Marwari Chamber of Commerce cabled to the Manchester Chamber of Commerce as follows :

"We appeal to you to intervene and persuade the Secretary of State for India to prevent the Partition of Bengal which has created a great tension of feeling here. The Bengalees have resolved in numerous public meetings to boycott British goods. The sale of Manchester goods has been practically stopped. We shall be ruined and shall not be able to make future contracts unless the Secretary of State withdraws the Partition and the boycott ceases. The matter is very urgent. Unless the cause is removed in three or four days by countermanding the Partition, goods for the Puja will remain unsold and the 'Lucky Day' sales will become impossible. Pray help us."[22]

This gloomy anticipation and the reports of the representatives of the *Statesman* are fully supported by the following extract from the Confidential Report by the Collector of Customs, Calcutta, dated 8th September, 1906, covering the first year of the Boycott movement :

"The boycott has been chiefly directed against salt, cotton piece-goods, and possibly yarn, boots and shoes, and cigarettes. A short statement is given below showing the importations or clearances of these for the past August, compared with the same month in 1905."

The annexed statement shows a decrease in the import of foreign salt by 1,40,000 *maunds* and increase in Indian (Aden) salt from 48 to 77 thousand *maunds*. The imported cotton piece-goods decreased by three crores of yards, and the value of imported cotton, twist and yarn fell by nearly a crore of rupees. The import of foreign shoes fell by 75 p. c. and of cigarettes by nearly 50 p. c.

The following extracts from official reports seem to indicate that the situation was pretty bad from the point of view of import during the next two years.

1. From Chief Secretary to the Government of Bengal to the Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department, dated 27th June, 1908 :

"The market in piece-goods is duller, and dealers are not anxious to indent, as prices show weakness in Lancashire, and many mills are working short time or closing for a period."

2. From same to same dated 24th August, 1908 : "It is reported that the smaller European firms have begun to feel the pinch of the boycott movement. Importers of miscellaneous goods are complaining of a particularly dull year. This, however, is probably largely due to the pervalent high prices of food. From reports received it appears that Java sugar is being largely purchased in Benaras as swadeshi."

3. From same to same, dated 7th October, 1908.

"Business in Manchester piece-goods is bad. The cotton the agitators and the boycott has been vigorously maintain- the agitators and the boycott has has been vigorously maintained. There has been, however, no active interference with shopkeepers or purchasers. There has been marked decrease in the sale of Manchester dhoties. Some consignments of shoes and boots of English manufacture marked 'Swadeshi' have been imported. It is stated that the mark is a formal sop to agitation, as the customers know what they are. But this of course is not certain."

One of the European firms in Bengal cabled as follows to England :

"Boycott result is disastrous. Boots are not salable ; the busy season has closed ; hosiery, hats and waist-bangles are also affected. A distinction is being made between English and continental goods. Japanese imports are doing very well at low prices. One firm has marked their English goods "Made in Germany" and succeeded in selling them."

"The British export trade returns for the month of December, 1908, as published in the *Times* of 22 January, 1909, show that cotton piece-goods declined in quantity by 89,065,000 yards, equal to 18.6 per cent., and in value by £ 1,514, 213, equal to 23.7 per cent. India was responsible for a decline of 77,416,000 yards.—which proves that India was mainly responsible for the

decline, Inida's share in the shortage being about seven-eighths in quantity and over a million pounds in value.''[23]

"From I. B. Records, West Bengal, we further learn that an intense Boycott agitation was going on in other districts too, viz. Bankura, Burdwan, Dacca, Dinajpur, Faridpur, Hooghly, Howrah, Jalpaiguri, Khulna, Mymensingh, Nadia, Noakhali, Pabna, Rajshahi, Rangpur, Tipperah and Puri. At Bogra there was a considerable decline in the Puja sale of Manchester cloth which fell, in a big shop, from Rs. 12,000 of the previous years to Rs. 300 in 1905. In Dinajpur the movement spread to the peasants, Hindus and Muslims alike, by September, 1905. In Faridpur the sale of Manchester cloth and Liverpool salt decreased very much in the next month. In Hooghly the boycott of Liverpool salt became so vigorous that the Police Superintendent recorded his inability to procure, when out in camp, even a small quantity of Liverpool salt for his personal use. In Mymensingh boycott assumed a very intense and almost a mass character.''[24] According to Police Reports the Boycott agitation was responsible for a large number of industrial strikes that took place about this time. Special reference is made to the strike of the employees of Burn & Co., Government of India Press, the Bengal Government Press, and the Fost Gloster Jute Mill.

The monthly report from Bengal to the Government of India for December (1909 ?) notes : "There can be no doubt that the sale of Manchester piece-goods has been seriously affected since the commencement of the boycott."

By this time the Boycott and *Swadeshi* movement merged itself into the great national movement launching the struggle for freedom. The question was no longer the boycott of British goods but of British rule. The purely economic aspect of Boycott movement seems to have recorded into the background. This is indicated by the following extract from the Monthly Report from Bengal for September, 1910. "British goods are being imported on a larger scale. The Government thinks that the boycott was on wane."

Stress should, however, be laid on the long-term and permanent effect of the Boycott and *Swadeshi* movement on the industrial regeneration of the country. "The weaving industry of India in particular received the greatest impetus from the

Swadeshi movement. By a systematic and relentless boycott of British cloths and by fostering and stimulating a temper for things *Swadeshi*, the national movement of 1905 created in the country a tremendous demand for indigenous articles. As the demand for indigenous cloths grew, increasing attempts were being made to start new mills. The first Indian Industrial Conference, held at Banaras in December, 1905, with Mr. R. C. Dutt as the President, was a very significant step in the direction of focussing public attention on the immense prospects and possibilities of native industries, and succeeded in inspiring their minds along the lines of constructive *Swadeshi*. Numerous *Swadeshi* articles, secured from the diverse parts of India, were there presented to the public at the Conference. A complete list of these articles, together with full particulars about their prices, and the names and addresses of the parties from whom they were available, was prepared and published in the form of a booklet at the time.[25]

R. C. Dutt, in his Presidental speech, made a masterly analysis of the current economic situation in India, and suggested some concrete lines of industrial development. Mr. Dutt had rendered yeoman's service by the 'publication of his two books on the economic history of India. The revelations made by him made a deep impression upon the Indians and must have paved the way for the *Swadeshi* movement. In any case, they went a great way in facilitating the success of the movement by preparing men's mind. Referring to his books Arabinda Ghose very justly remarked : "Without the Economic History and its damning story of England's commercial and fiscal dealings with India, we doubt whether the public mind would have been ready for the boycott. In this one instance it may be said of him that he not only wrote history but created it."[26]

The indirect effect of Boycott on Indian politics and national movement was also very great. It supplied the Indians a tremendous weapon which, properly wielded, was capable of dealing a severe blow to the British. Thus, for the first time, they could give up the policy of 'mendicancy' which had been so long pursued by the Indian National Congress. It enabled the Indians to stand on their own legs, and gave them self-con-

fidence in the inevitable struggle for freedom. This point will be further discussed in section VI.

IV. NATIONAL EDUCATION.

1. Repressive Measures Against Students.

It is a great tribute to education as a formative influence in human life that in all ages and countries, despots and tyrants, as well as those who rebel against them, make it one ol their chief objectives to control the education and enlist the sympathy and support of the students on their side. The British rulers in India in 1905 had an additional incentive in following the time-honoured doctrine. For, the leaders of the *Swadeshi* movement had stolen a march over them and won over the student community, almost overnight. Indeed, it would be hardly any exaggeration to say that the students proved to be the chief props and pillars of the *Swadeshi* and Boycott movement from the very beginning. Their youthful enthusiasm was fired by the speeches of the leaders, and they jumped into the fight with alacrity, not being restrained by fear of consequences and careful calculation of pros and cons which would have chilled the ardour of older and more experienced men.

The initial success of the Boycott movement, measured by the decline in import of British goods, alarmed the Government. Apart from the interest they naturally felt in the material prosperity of their own country, the British officials knew that to the British public the amount of wealth annually drained from India to their country was the only measuring rod of the efficiency and success of British rule in India. The influence of Manchester on the British Government was only too well-known, and any adverse effect on Manchester's trade with India in cotton goods was likely to have great repercussion on British politics. The sudden and steady decline in the import of British goods, particularly cotton cloth, was therefore an incentive to both the leaders of the *Swadeshi* movement and the Government of India, urging the former to press home the boycott of British goods, and the latter to frustrate such an attempt at any cost. As the students were believed, perhaps rightly, to have been the main instrument in promoting boycott, the Government decided to liquidate this element as far as possible.

The first step taken by the Government for this purpose was to send a secret circular to the Magistrates and Collectors on 10 October, 1905. As this was issued over the signature of Mr. R. W. Carlyle, officiating Chief Scretary to the Government of Bengal, it was generally called the Carlyle Circular. The following is the text of this Circular which earned unenviable notoriety for several years to come :

"1. The use which has recently been made of school-boys and students for political purposes is absolutely subversive of discipline, and in the highest degree injurious to the interest of the boys themselves. It is impossible to tolerate this in connection with institutions which Government either assists or countenances.

"2. I am, therefore, to request that if any attempt is made by boys attending any school or college in your district to take any public action in connection with boycotting, picketing, and other abuses, associated with the so-called *Swadeshi movement*, you will at once take congizance of that action. You will inform the heads of schools or colleges concerned that unless they prevent such action being taken by the boys attending their institution, their grant-in-aid and the privilege of competing for scholarships and of receiving scholarship-holders will be withdrawn, and the University be asked to disaffiliate their institutions. Of course if they are loyally desirous to prevent this, but are unable to do so, they will not be punished. In that case they must immediately report the matter giving a list of boys who have set at naught their authority. You will then be in a position to see that necessary disciplinary action is taken, or punishment awarded, by the educational authorities.

"3. You ought also to inform the heads and teachers of institutions, and those connected with management that it may be necessary for you to call on them for assistance in keeping the peace by enrolling them as special constables, and you should not hesitate to enrol them should there be any reasonable apprehension of disturbances on the part of school-boys or students. It is very important in the event of any disturbance to have the services of those whom the boys are bound to respect, and who will be able to recognise and identify the boys who

offend. This should be explained to those in authority in the instituaion.''[27]

About the same time, Mr. Pedler, the Director of Public Instruction, wrote a letter, dated 21 October, 1905, to the Principals of certain Calcutta colleges, asking them to show cause why the students belonging to their institutions, who took part in the picketing in the Harrison Road and disturbances that followed on 3 Ocober, 1905, should not be expelled. This letter found its way to the Press on 26 October.

The publication of the Carlyle Circular had already created a great sensation all over the country. Its effect was heightened by he publication of Pedler's letter. There was a storm of indignation in the two Bengals, and the Indian-owned press denounced them in the strongest possible language. The public interpreted the two documents as an open challenge to the *Swadeshi* movement and a firm determination on the part of the Government to keep the students away from it. Perhaps the Government was taken aback by the vehemence of opposition. In any case, it tried to explain away the hated Carlyle Circular which had been received with a chorus of condemnation.[28]

The public of Bengal, however, took up the challenge without any delay or hesitation. A public meeting was held on 24 October, 1905, under the chairmanship of Abdul Rasul, in which eminent speakers like B. C. Pal not only condemned the Carlyle Circular but also suggested the inauguration of an independent system of National Education. This is the genesis of the movement which led to the establishment of a National Council of Education, as will be related later.

Another meeting was held on the same day at College Square, attended by about two thousand Muslims, who took the solemn vow of the *Swadeshi* movement.

"This was followed by a general meeting on October 27 at the residence of Charu Chandra Mallick, Pataldanga, with Rabindra Nath Tagore in the chair and attended by such distinguished men as Bhupendra Nath Basu, Krishna Kumar Mitra, Satis Chandra Mukherjee, Bipin Chandra Pal, Monoranjan Guha Thakurta and others. About one thousand students hailing from different colleges took the decision not to bow down to the

threats of the Carlyle Circular and to continue their work manfully for the country's cause. Rabindra Nath spoke eloquently against the damaging Circular issued by the Government and expressed his wholehearted support for the stand taken by the student community''.[29]

In spite of the attempt of the Government to explain away Carlyle Circular, its real character, as an expression of Government policy, was revealed by its counterpart in East Bengal. The Carlyle Circular was issued in Bengal by its Chief Secretary on 10 October, 1905. Six days later, Mr. P. C. Lyon, the Chief Secretary to the Government of Eastern Bengal and Assam, addressed a letter to the Commissioners and District Officers. "It is of course most undesirable," wrote Mr. Lyon, "that young men, who are under tuition, should be employed in any political agitation which is really anti-British, by whatever name it may call itself. You have, it is understood, already warned the proprietory, managing, or instructional authorities of colleges and schools that their pupils must cease to act as touts for the boycotting of British goods. If any institution disregards your advice the case should be reported to me without delay, and when reporting the case you should issue a second formal warning that a disregard of the interests of the Government and of discipline in this matter will entail the formal and public barring of the pupils of the college, or school, from all service under the Government''.

This letter unleashed the forces of repression in East Bengal. This is illustrated by the incidents that took place at Rangpur shortly after.

'Under instruction from Mr. T. Emerson, the local Magistrate, the Head Master of the Rangpur Zilla School, Mr. A. K. Ghosh, issued on 31 October, 1905, a circular prohibiting the students from "participation in boycotting, picketting and other abuses" on pain of severe disciplinary action. The students defied this order and the same afternoon attended a *Swadeshi* meeting, sang national songs, and shouted *Bande Mataram* on their way back home. Again, on the next day (November 1, 1905), the students of the Rangpur Zilla School and local Technical School attended a still bigger meeting and read the National Manifesto proclaiming the nation's determi-

nation to undo the evil effects of the Partition by every means. The authorities concerned took a serious view of the students' conduct, and on the following day (November 2) the District Magistrate of Rangpur communicated to the Head Master of the local Zilla School the following order : 'These boys are fined Rs. 5/- each and not allowed to attend the classes until the fines have been paid. Head Master to warn them that repetition of this offence will endanger the existence of the school and to send a copy of this to their parents.' On the next day, the Head Master communicated the Magistrate's order to the 86 boys concerned. Fifty-six students of the local Technical School were similarly fined on the same day under the Magistrate's order. The guardians, seeing no fault of their wards, refused to pay the fines and allow their boys to attend the schools. Thus an open conflict with the authorities commenced. On November 7, the citizens of Rangpur, assembled at a public conference, resolved to take the education of their boys into their own hands, and to start a national institution for this purpose. The outcome of this public decision was the Rangpur National School which was set up on November 8, 1905, exclusively under national control. It became a symbol of successful *Swadeshi* in those days.'[30]

It is interesting to note in this connection that in reply to an inquiry by some of the guardians as to why the boys had been fined and expelled, the District Magistrate gave the following reply : "The boys have been fined for attending a political meeting and shouting in public on the road and maidan."[31] The action of the Magistrate was not based on any specific provision in the Circulars. It is, therefore, quite clear that the Magistrates felt themselves authorized to usurp the functions of the authorities of the educational institutions concerned and to take any steps they thought fit to chastise the students who cherished any *Swadeshi* spirit. Another point of interest is that the Government required each teacher in a School to act as an agent on behalf of the Government, to watch the conduct of the students, and send reports about them, thus virtually acting as spies. This is proved by the following passage in the Circular of the Head Master of the Rangpur School referred to above.

"Every assistant teacher is requested to explain to the boys

that such a practice is absolutely subversive of discipline, and most injurious to their interests and studies. He is also requested to see, both in the school and out of the school, that the boys do not meet together for such purpose, or disturb the peace by taking any part in boycotting movement. If there be any fear of such disturbances, the names of the boys should be reported to the undersigned.''[32]

The events at Rangpur had great repercussion all over Bengal. Protest meetings were held in Calcutta, and the idea of a National University was seriously discussed by eminent leaders. In order to combat the repressive policy, sanctioned by the Carlyle Circular, and actually followed at Rangpur, an Anti-Circular Society was established in Calcutta with Sachindra Prasad Basu, a student of the B.A. class and the leader of the student community, as its Secretary.

But Rangpur did not stand alone. Things happened in other parts of East Bengal which made men think that with the capital city of Dacca the autocratic regime of the medieval Muslim monarchs had returned. It is impossible to refer to all these cases. But one or two incidents may be described, with particulars, in order to illustrate the relentless policy of oppression pursued by Sir Bampfylde Fuller's Government.

A notable incident happened at Madaripur, the headquarters of a sub-division in Faridpur District. 'A student of the local school, accompanied by his friends, was going back home from school with his umbrella unfurled overhead, when a European, belonging to the office of Messrs Landale Clarke and Company, jute merchants, who happened to go the same way, pushed the umbrella of the boy. As the boy then held the umbrella in tighter grip, thinking that some of his class-fellows had pushed from behind his umbrella in jest, tension soon developed between the student and the said European until the latter threw the former down on the ground. What is more, the European asked his three Chaprasis, who were also accompanying him, to get hold of the boy and beat him. The order was instantaneously carried out. The victorious hero then marched home with flying colours, whence he despatched a letter to the Head Master of the school in a peremptory tone, asking him to call at his residence, informing him that his pupils had insulted him and

so he should deal out condign punishment to them. The Head Master of the school, Sri Kali Prasanna Dasgupta, wrote to him in reply that he got a different version of the case, and that the European might, if he so liked, come to his school where he was ready to consider the case. This the European did not evidently like. In the meantime, a *Chaprasi* of his, who had been sent out on some errand, reported on his return that he had been beaten by somebody.

'The European immediately reported the matter to the Government of the New Province. The Inspector of Schools, Mr. Stapleton, came down to Madaripur to hold a departmental inquiry and asked the Head Master to find out the offenders so that he might punish them at once. The spirited Head Master said that if the matter were entrusted to him, he might do so, for, with the rigour of justice he combined the affection of a teacher, but he was by no means ready to hand his pupils over to the Inspector for punishment at his hands. Thinking that it was surely the students of the upper forms of the school who were the offenders, Mr. Stapleton next suggested that Rs. 200/- should be paid by them collectively to the *Chaprasi* for compensation. After some higgling and haggling, the Inspector came down at last to Rs. 25/- as compensation. Just at this moment Mr. Fuller, the Lieutenant-Governor of the New Province, wrote to say that the students of the first three classes should be fined Rs. 150/-, that the sum should be made over to the Government, and that the Head Master should whip the boys in the presence of the Sub-Divisional Officer of Madaripur. The Head Master however refused to carry out the orders of Government.'[33]

It is needless to add that the East Bengal Government could not tolerate a Head Master who loved his students and had the courage to do his duty. "On the Head Master's refusal to comply with the Govermental orders, the Inspector of Schlools requested the Secretary of the said institution to ask the Head Master to tender his resignation at once, adding at the same time that in case of non-compliance with his request, the students of that school would be debarred from service under Government, and, moreover, steps would be taken to disaffiliate the school. Representatives of eleven high schools of the Madaripur

Sub-Division met at a specially summoned conference of teachers held at Madaripur. Several resolutions were passed, justifying the conduct of the Head Master of the Madaripur school, and a Standing Committee was formed. Mr. Hallward, the officiating D. P. I. in the new Province, thereupon asked the authorities of those eleven High schools to call upon those of their teachers who were members of the Standing Committee formed at the conference to tender their resignations at once and, on their refusal, to dismiss them."[34] Reports of Governmental repression also came during the same period from Dacca, Serajgunj, Banaripara, Jalpaiguri, Burdwan, Hooghly, Ranigunge, Asansol and other mofussil towns.

The Madaripur incident provoked, in any case was followed by, two important circulars which throw interesting light on the policy of the Government and the mentality of the Lieutenant-Governor, Mr. (later Sir) Bampfylde Fuller. Both were issued by Mr. P. C. Lyon, the Chief Secretary, on 8 November, 1905. The first, addressed to the Inspector of Schools, Dacca Division, read as follows :

"Sir, I am directed to communicate to you the wishes of Government in regard to the participation of students in political movements.

The Lieutenant-Governor is convinced that students who are permitted to take an active part in political agitation or demonstration suffer very greatly in education and discipline, and when these movements are directed against measures of State, it is likely that young men and boys in their inexperience will be unable to distinguish between the legitimate and the illegitimate and will contract a bias against the Government which will not be compatible with good citizenship. His Honour is aware that these are the views held by a large number of parents who unwillingly see their boys drawn into a net of excitement which is a serious drag on the progress of their studies. Gentlemen who own, manage, or conduct educational institutions should be advised to discourage the students of their colleges or schools from attending political meetings or from taking part in processions or the like, and should the Principals or Head Masters of Government Institutions find themselves unable to control their students or find that their subordinates fail to

render them due assistance in exercising a proper control, they should report the circumstance.

"Should the management of an aided institution refuse to accept these principles, its grant will be withdrawn. And if Mr. Fuller learns that any educational institution is a focus of political agitation or does anything to facilitate the subjection of students to the disturbing excitement of political controversy, he will consider it expedient in the interest of the State to debar its students absolutely from Government service. It is obvious that students brought up under influences which are hostile to the State cannot be expected to serve the State loyally. Cases to which these remarks apply should be reported to Government. These observations apply of course to the active participation of students in promoting the boycott of foreign goods, a movement which has taken developments what go far beyond the laudable idea of encouraging home-manufactures and are a serious danger to the public tranquillity."[35]

The following is the full text of the other circular, addressed to the Commissioner, Dacca Division.

"I am desired by the Lieutenant-Governor to inform you that incidents have recently occurred which indicate that the shouting of the cry "Bande Mataram" in the streets or other public places is likely to provoke breaches of the peace. It should accordingly be stopped. I am to request that you will issue the necessary instructions to the Police to this effect.

2. I am desired also to say that in the present state of public feelings, political or quasi-political meetings should not be permitted in public places though they may, of course, be held in private compounds. Processions or such meetings may pass through the streets provided that they are orderly, but no music or shouting should be allowed. This order should also be held to apply to *Sankirtan* parties.

3. Mr. Fuller has also been informed that in some places English ladies cannot drive along station roads without risk of insult or annoyance. This serious reproach to the administration must cease absolutely. The police on the beat along the road should, if needful, be strengthend, should have orders to interfere in all cases in which rudeness is offered to Europeans or

Mussalmans, taking down names and addresses, and if the latter are refused, conducting the offender to the Thana.''[36]

2. National Council of Education

The repressive measures adopted by the Government resulted in the expulsion of a large number of students from schools and colleges. The question of providing for their education naturally agitated the minds of the leaders, and, as mentioned above, national schools were started in some localities. This brought into prominence two institutions which played a prominent role in the history of the *Swadeshi* movement. These were the 'Anti-Circular Society' and the 'Dawn Society.'

Reference has been made above to the origin of the Anti-Circular Society and its energetic student-founder Sachindra Prasad Basu. It was essentially a students' association, and at the beginning, organized daily a Procession Party which paraded the streets of Calcutta, singing national songs, picketing at imporant points of the city, and collecting funds. Soon Maulavi Leakat Hossain took charge of the Procession Party. He assembled a number of young boys at College Square every evening and went out in procession.

"As days rolled on, the Society's scope of activities widened in five distinct but allied directions, comprising education, enquiry, sale, supply and propaganda. The object of the first section was to arrange education for those students who were expelled from Government institutions or were punished for the *Swadeshi* cause. The object of the second section was to preach *Swadeshi* ideals through songs along public roads. The object of the third section was to enquire about those who purchased foreign goods and to see whether they could be prevented from any such purchase by request and entreaty, and persuade the dealers in foreign goods to return or destroy them. The object of the fourth section was to supply *Swadeshi* cloths without profit to every house, both in towns and villages. The object of the last section was to arrange lectures on *Swadeshi* at public places and to carry on sustained propaganda in favour of the *Swadeshi* cause. The branches of the Society were also established in the mofussil areas".[37]

Anti-Circular Society's "programme of work to provide education for the students expelled under Governmental orders

proved to be a very valuable and constructive factor in the march of the *Swadeshi* movement."[38]

It had already the Rangpur National School to its credit and its members visited various parts of Bengal to feel the pulse of the students and their guardians and devise with them the future line of policy. It was largely due to this organized activity that the Government repression, severe though it was, failed to crush the students' spirit of resistance, and led them to look forward to a new scheme of education based on national ideals.

To this noble impulse a great impetus was given by the 'Dawn Society', a non-political institute of culture. It was founded in 1902, as a protest against the Report of the Indian Universities Commission, 1902. It was a students' organization, and run in the main by the students themselves under the able control and guidance of its Secretary, Satis Chandra Mukherji. Satis Chandra was a remarkable man in many respects, and had already achieved distinction as as the editor of the *Dawn*, founded in 1897. At the initial stage the *Dawn's* main activity was to propagate, among other things, India's moral and spiritual ideals. When the Report of the Universities' Commission was published in 1902, the most uncompromising criticism was offered by Satis Chandra. The cry for thorough overhauling of the whole system of University education was in the air, and Satis Chandra founded the Dawn Society as the first step to give a definite shape to the new ideal. Its main object was to remove the deficiencies of the University education in two ways. In the first place, it sought to impart religious and moral instruction to the students in order to build up their character. Secondly, it supplemented the academic education imparted in the Colleges by training the students in such a manner as to enable them to function as self-conscious agents in the classes. The students were to be trained "in the methods of assimilating knowledge, of digesting knowledge, of writing out the substance of what they hear, and of discussing the subjects on which they have heard lectures."

"The fundamental ideal that inspired this double line of action was to train up the students as patriots and workers for

the country's cause. Intense nationalism was the basis and foundation of the Society.''[39]

The Dawn Society was soon developed into a nursery of patriotism, and its "extra-mural" education was calculated to foster in the heart of the students sentiments of nationalism and the spirit of self-sacrifice for the country.

"With the march of time as the Dawn Society was progressing, the scope of its activities was also broadened in the direction of industries. Vocational training since then became an important part of the Society's ideology. Under the Industrial Section of the Society, a Swadeshi Store was opened in 1903 with the object of promoting genuine interest in the students in the native industries of India. It was managed wholly by the young members of the Society, where home-made articles of various kinds were collected by the boys themselves and sold by them daily in the afternoon. In course of a single year from June, 1903, to June, 1904, the *Swadeshi* Store sold indigenous articles to the tune of Rupees ten thousand. By promoting the sale of indigenous goods, by popularising the home-made products in a variety of ways,—lectures and exhibitions,—by publishing in the *Dawn* regular notes and news on Indian economy, and, above all, by training a large band of active workers aflame with the *Swadeshi* spirit, the Dawn Society gave a most powerful impetus to the movement for the industrial regeneration of the country.

"Satis Chandra's activity in this line is all the more important because his various activities for the cause of economic *Swadeshi* were undertaken long before the formal beginning of the *Swadeshi* Movement on August 7, 1905. In fact, the ideologies of the *Swadeshi* Movement were laid substantially on the ideas and activities of the Dawn Society. It created a Swadeshi temper and spirit among a large number of men of our country and paved the path to a large extent for the advent of the *Swadeshi* Movement. It is, therefore, quite in fitness of things that the Dawn Society should become a most active centre of the Swadeshi Movement after its formal commencement.''[40]

But great as was the Dawn Society's contribution to the industrial *Swadeshi*, it will go down in history for what it did in promoting the *Swadeshi* spirit in education. Reference has

been made above to the repressive measures of Government against students at Rangpur and its immediate reactions, namely, the foundation of the Rangpur National School and the Anti-Circular Society, and a large number of protest meetings held in Calcutta. The most memorable among these is the one held under the auspices of the Dawn Society on 5 November, 1905. It was "a crowded meeting of about 2000 students addressed by Rabindra Nath Tagore, Satis Chandra Mukhherji and Hirendra Nath Datta. Satis Chandra exhorted the students to sever all connections with the officialised University and to boycott its examinations. This was followed by that famous meeting at the *Panti's Math* on 9 November, when Subodh Chandra Mallik promised the gift of one lakh of rupees to the cause of National Education and at once earned the coveted title of "Raja" from his grateful countrymen. On the following day was announced the promised donation of rupees five lakhs to be made by a Zemindar friend of Satis Chandra to the National Education cause. This Zemindar friend of Satis Chandra was no other than the late Brojendra Kishore Roy Choudhury of Gouripur, Mymensingh."[41]

On 11 November was held, at the College Square, a huge students' meeting attended by about ten thousand young men and presided over by the barrister Ashutosh Chaudhury. The Rangpur and Madaripur events were unreservedly condemned and the immediate need for establishing a National University was discussed by Satis Chandra Mukherjee, Bepin Chandra Pal, Hirendra Nath Datta and others.[42] Three days after this meeting, Ashutosh Chaudhury addressed a letter to the leading men of the country inviting them to a Conference on 16 November. The object of the Conference was thus explained in the letter.

"Dear Sir,

"A very large number of students has apparently determined not to go up for the University Examinations this year. Their idea is to sever all connection with the Calcutta University, and join some educational institution under national control. There is no such institution now and the question of establishing one, if we are to provide for these students and others who are likely to follow their lead, must be at once taken up and finally determined.

"Most of us were unware of this intense feeling amongst the student community, and I for one had not realised it, nor was I inclined to believe in its existence, until last Saturday when I attended a meeting of students, at the request of Babu Hirendra Nath Datta, one of our most sedate public men. At that meeting, consisting of over five thousand stduents, I felt for the first time the urgency of the matter, and I beg of you to take note of the fact and decide what we ought to do under the circumstances .....

"Last Saturday I found the students determined to take a decisive step on Monday, the 13th November. I was able to prevent that, by promising to get our leaders to take up the matter, and give it their earnest consideration. They wanted to know on Sunday, if they could count upon their help and if so, hw soon they could arrive at a decision. I asked them to allow some time but they resolved to wait only up to Thursday, the 16th instant, 5 P.M."[43]

It was a historic conference that met on 16 November, 1905. Never before had so many eminent sons of Bengal met on a common platform. For, it was attended, among others, by Gurudas Banerji, Satis Chandra Mukherji Hirendra Nath Datta, Ashutosh Chaudhury, Rashbehari Ghosh, Rabindra Nath Tagore, Tarak Nath Palit, Byomkesh Chakravarty, Chitta Ranjan Das, Abdul Rasul, Nilratan Sircar, Brajendra Nath Seal,, Lal Mohan Ghosh, Surendra Nath Banerji, Bepin Chandra Pal, Motilal Ghosh and Subodh Chandra Mallik. Some distinguished students of the Calcutta University were also invited to this meeting.[44] After several hours' animated discussion the Conference adopted two main resolutions, the substantial part of which ran thus :

(i) "That in the opinion of this Conference it is desirable and necessary that a National Council of Education should be at once established to organise a system of Education—Literary, Scientific and Technical—on National lines and under National control."

(ii) "That this Conference, while fully appreciating the devotion and self-sacrifice of the P. R. S., M.A. and other students, is of opinion that it is desirable in the interest they are

seeking to serve, that they should appear in the ensuing examinations."

"It was also announced at this Conniference that besides the promised one lakh of rupees from Subodth Chandra Mallik and five lakhs of rupees (to be paid in cash or in property yielding Rs. 20,000/- a year) from 'another gentleman' (referring to Brojendra Kishore Roy Chowdhury), a third gentleman (whose name was not disclosed) 'offered two lakhs in cash and a large house with compound,' while a fourth donor was likely to make an endowment of Rs. 30,000/- a year."[45]

It was left to Satis Chandra Mukherji to give a concrete shape to the idea of an independent educational system on national lines. No better man could be chosen for the purpose. Benoy Kumar Sarkar juslty wrote of him : "From 14 November, 1905 (the date of Chaudhury's Manifesto) to 14 August, 1906 (the date of the formal inauguration of Bengal National College) the history of the national education movement is virtually the biography of Satis Mukherji. It was almost exclusively by him that the burden of moulding the new ideology into a concrete pattern was shouldered."[46] The pattern, as it finally emerged from the deliberations of the Committees and Conferences, may be gathered from the following regulations ;

"Name—The National Council of Education—*Jatiya Shiksha Parishad.*

"The object of the Council is to impart Education—Literary as well as Scientific and Technical—on National Lines and exclusively under National Control, *not in opposition to, but standing apart from*, the existing systems of Primary, Secondary and University Education.

Education on National Lines should imply *among other things* :—

1. (a) Imparting of Education, *ordinarily* through the medium of the Vernaculars, English being a compulsory subject.

(b) The preparation of suitable tex-books, especially in the Vernaculars.

2. Promoting of Physical and Moral Education and ***Providing for denominational Religious Education out of funds specially contributed for that purpose and inspiring students***

with a genuine love for, and a real desire to serve, their country.

Such Religious Education is not to include the enforcement of religious rites and practices.

3. *Attaching a special importance to* a knowledge of the country, its Literature, History and Philosophy *and incorporating with the best Oriental ideals of life and thought the best assimilable ideals of the West.*

4. Imparting of Scientific, Professional and Technical Education chiefly in those bracnes of Science, Arts *And Industries* which are best calculated to develop the material resources of the country, and to satisfy its pressing wants.

5. Inclusion *in scientific education generally of a knowledge of the scientific truths embodied in oriental learning and* in medical education *specially of such scientific truths as are to be found in the Ayurvedic and Hakim system.*"[47]

"While almost all the great nationalist leaders of Bengal strongly felt in their heart of hearts the utter inadequacy of the phevailing sysem of English education, all were not, however, in favour of total boycotting of the Calcutta University. The existing eystem of education was everywhere condemned as all-too academic and all-too literary. The extreme group headed by Gurudas Banerji, Satis Chandra Mukherji, Hirendra Nath Datta, Ashutosh Chaudhury, Subodh Chandra Mallik,, Brojendra Kishore Roy Choudhury and others stood for complete educational autarchy and aspired after instituting the "three-dimensional system" of education,—Literary, Scientific and Technical combined,—on national lines and under national control. The moderate group headed by Tarak Nath Palit, Bhupendra Nath Basu, Nagendra Nath Ghose, Nilratan Sircar, Manindra Chandra Nandy and others wanted simply to supplement all-too literary education of the existing system by a regular arrangement for technical education under national management."[48]

There was a split among the leaders over the issue. For the time being the former triumphed. But on the "very day (June 1, 1906) when the National Council of Education (N. C. E.) was officially registered, a second organisation, rival

to the N. C. E., was ushered into existence by Tarak Nath Palit and others. This institution was named the Society for the Promotion of Technical Education (S. P. T. E.). In sociological analysis, the N. C. E. represented the extreme or radical aspirations of the day (1905-06), while the S. P. T. E. embodied the moderatist views of educational reform. It should be added that Rashbehari Ghose, the President of the N. C. E., was also the Presndent of the S. P. T. E., while many Bengali leaders were members of both the organisations. The former set up the Bengal National College and School (August 14, 1906), while the latter founded the Bengal Technical Institute (July 25, 1906)."[49]

Thhe National College was started under the best auspices possible. Arabinda Ghose resigned the post which he held at Baroda on a salary of Rs. 750/-, per month, in order to serve the National College as its Principal. At first he was unwilling to accept any salary, but at last agreed to accept Rs. 75/- a month. But as it was impossible to maintain himself on that amount he was ultimately induced to take Rs. 150/- as monthly salary. He was ably assisted by Satis Chandra Mukherji, who devoted his life to the cause of national education. Satis Chandra was nominally the Superintendent, but really the heart and soul of the National College, for Arabinda was soon engrossed in political activities as the leader of the 'Extremist' or 'Nationalist' party and could not devote enough time or energy to the affairs of the National College. In August, 1906, when National College began its work, Bepin Chandra Pal founded the *Bande Mataram*, a Nationalist Daily. Arabinda was intimately associated with it and soon virtually, though not in name, became its editor. It was beyond the capacity of one man, even of Arabinda, to carry on as Principal of the National College and Editor of the *Bande Mataram*. Besides, the fiery articles in the *Bande Mataram* drew down upon it the wrath of the Government. On 8 June, 1907, the Government issued a formal warning to the editor of the *Bande Mataram* 'for using language which is a direct incentive to violence and lawlessness.' The Government started a campaign of repression against newspapers in July, 1907, and on 30th of that month the *Bande Mataram* office was searched by the police. Arabinda told

Satis Chandra that he might be spirited away to prison at any moment, and his association with the National College might cause great damage to the institution. So he resigned from the college on 2 August, 1907. We may catch a glimpse of his mind at this time from the following extract of his reply to the farewell address given him by the students of the National College on 23 August, 1907 : "There are times in a nation's history when Providence places before it one work, one aim, to which everything else, however high and noble in itself, has to be sacrificed. Such a time has now arrived for our motherland when nothing is dearer than her service, when everything else is to be directed to that end...Work that she may prosper. Suffer that she may rejoice. All is contained in that one single advice."[50]

On Arabinda's resignation, Satis Chandra took up his work as Principal in addition to his duties as Superintendent, but illness caused him to retire from both these posts towards the end of 1908.

In the meanwhile the activities of the National Council had spread to the *mofussil* areas of Bengal. Excepting the Rangpur National School (8th November, 1905) and the Dacca National School (Decembr, 1905), all the National Schools founded in Bengal were directly influenced by, nay, brught into existence under the impact of the N. C. E. Up to December, 1907, the number of Secondary National Schools was twenty, out of which ten were affiliated to the National Council. In 1908 the number rose to 25, and there were, besides, some 300 Primary National Schools.

"The progress of National Education which was recognised in 1906 by the Indian National Congress 'as one of the main planks in its platform' received a further impetus in the Bengal Provincial Conference held at Pabna, with Rabindra Nath Tagore in the chair, in the second week of February, 1908." It passed the following resolution : "That in the opinion of this Conference steps should be taken for promoting a system of education, literary, scientific, and technical, suited to the requirements of the country, on national lines, under national control, and to establish and maintain national schools throughout the country."[51]

The unfortunate split between the National Council of Education and the Society for the Promotion of Technical Education came to an end in 1910 by the merger of the two in one Institution, "on condition that the Arts and Pure Science Department under it should be called the Bengal National College, and the Technical and Applied Science Department under it be called the Bengal Technical Institute, to be separately managed by two Committees under the National Council of Education."[52]

The deliberations of the Bengal National Conference in 1908 clearly indicate the great strides that the *Swadeshi* movement had made in promoting the nationalist ideas. The resolution, referred to above, is very significant, inasmuch as it laid down the establishment of National Schools throughout the country as part of a general policy. In moving this resolution Arabinda Ghose explained in a few words the object of maintaining these schools. "The National Schools", said he, "will train and send out workers who will devote themselves completely to the service of the country and raise her once more to the old position of glory which she once occupied in the scale of nations"[53]

In view of the growing public interest in National Education, a special conference was held at Pabna, attended by about ten thousand men. Rabindra Nath Tagore delivered a stirring speech in course of which he said : "The control and direction by foreigners of education in India was a most unnatural phenomenon not to be met with elsewhere." "Now that the people of Bengal had just asserted their right, and recognised their duty of providing for public instruction by their own efforts and means and had already given a proof of their earnestness, by establishing on a firm footing the National Council of Education, there was hardly any necessity of going in for any other education that is not under national control. It is the fulfilment of the needs of the country that is the aim and end of National Education in India which it will realise by building up true sons of the country who will make her service an absorbing life-work and not a mere leisure-hour business taken up as a variety, who away from titles, without any hope of reward or recognition, will quietly organise the villages, the real

seat of the country's strength, and lay there the foundation of the India to be."[54]

The National Education Conference was followed by the District Conference of Pabna. Once more Arabinda Ghose explained the aims and ideals of national education. He pointed out "that the University system was defective in its aims and methods intended only to serve the purposes of the Government, not the requirements of the country. It turned out machines for administrative and professional work, not men. The National system of Education was intended to create a nation. It must produce men with all their faculties trained, full of patriotism, and mentally, morally, physically, the equals of the men of any other nation." "As soon as Arabinda had finished his speech, a local pleader, Dinanath Biswas, leaped to the platform and promised on the spot a donation of Rs. 500/-, a monthly subscription of Rs. 5/-, and two of his own children as aids to the foundation of the National School there. This magnificent offer was the beginning of a flood of similar offers, until the subscriptions swelled to the handsome sum of Rs. 2,700/- and that was the beginning of the Pabna National School which was organised before long. Thus National Education was spreading apace in the various mofussil towns of Bengal, and that was a remarkable sign of the times."[54a]

The enthusiasm with which the two Bengals responded to the idea of national education shows the way in which the *Swadeshi* movement, like a mighty river, was overflowing its banks, and inundating vast stretches of country. It was no longer confined to its primary object of industrial regeneration and boycotting British goods. More important still, the movement, with its extended connotation, was no longer confined to Bengal but spread over the whole of India. This is proved by the unanimous acceptance of a resolution in its favour by the Indian National Congress in its Calcutta session of December, 1906, as will be noted later. In moving this resolution Hirendra Nath Datta very clearly explained the different aspects of the *Swadeshi* movement. "I have often thought", said he, "that" Swadeshism was a goddes with more than one face, like the Roman Janus, who has descended in our midst for the regeneration of India and by the worship of whom we would attain to

what our venerable President has called '*swaraj*', that is, self-government, a word which has given trouble to the old hysterical woman who presides in Hare Street. This '*swaraj*' or self-government is the only remedy in which alone lie our hope and strength and our greatness. The goddess is a three-faced goddess. The one face or aspect of the goddess is political, the second face is industrial, and last, and not the least, is the educational." He observed that our countrymen had "not yet fully realised the importance of education as a factor in the life of a nation. If we have fully recognised that education plays a most important part in national regeneration we think this resolution hardly needs any moving and seconding at all." "He then quoted the words of a great modern writer who said 'Give me the training of the youths of the nation, and I do not care who governs the country.' Mr. Datta said, 'That is exactly the position I would take up.'"[54b]

It was, however, not long before the National College lost its popularity and virtually ceased to exist. The Bengal Technical Institute, however, survived and continued as a popular institution throughout the period under review.

Some have ascribed the disaster to the merger of the two in 1910. But it would perhaps be more correct to say that while the merger might have hastened the process, the doom of the National College was inevitable. The reason is not far to seek. The popular enthusiasm for the national education was more an expression of hatred against the Government than the result of a genuine desire to be educated on national lines. In any case, such a desire was not strong enough to call for the sacrifice that the study in National College involved. The middle class of Bengal values higher education mainly as a means of decent livelihood. But the students of the National College were not eligible for the posts for which alone literary education qualified a young man, such as those of teachers, lawyers, doctors, etc., not to speak of lucrative appointments under the Government. To the Bengalis of those days the admission into National College meant an end of all hopes of ease and security in life, and a move into wilderness. If, in spite of this, students were attracted to it at the beginning, it was mainly because a section of the students entertained a strong

hatred towards the schools and colleges under the Calcutta University which were controlled by the Government and therefore regarded as *'Gholam-khana'* (manufactory of slaves). Besides, a large group of students, expelled from schools and colleges for partaking in the Boycott movement, had perforce to join these institutions. It may be recalled that it was the need to provide for such students that originated the idea of National Eduction. But the number of expelled students was never large enough to maintain the National College, and the number of its students dwindled along with the number of expelled students. The same thing was true of the national schools.

The Technical Institute flourished, not *because*, but *in spite of* its being a national institution, for there was a real need for it apart from any ideology or sentiment. It was joined mostly by students who could not afford to receive such training or education in any other way, and those who passed from it could earn their livelihood independently of the posts and professions controlled by the Government.

It may be incidentally mentioned here that a section of sober politicians, mostly belonging to the Moderate school, fully realized the above implications of the National Education. They were consequently lukewarm to the idea and definitely opposed to the boycott of the Calcutta University, which received enthusiastic support from the Extremists, who soon made the question a live political issue, to the detriment of their opponents. As a matter of fact the Moderates lost their popularity to a certain extent because they lagged behind the Extremist leaders in their enthusiasm for the boycott of "*Golam-khanas*' i.e. colleges and schools under the Calcutta University. On "November 17, 1905, at a very crowded meeting of 15,000 persons at the Field and Academy Club, Surendra Nath told the students that while it was desirable to establish a National University in the country, it was not desirable to leave the Calcutta University all of a sudden."[55] This speech caused an uproar among the audience. "Hemendra Prasad Ghose informs us that those who could not brook only twelve days ago at Shyampukur in North Calcutta the insinuation against Surendranath now came forward to condemn their erstwhile le His public utterance on

November 17 was viewed as an expression of his moderatism and his inability to march on with the movement. The youthful votaries of the Swadeshi Movement wanted to march forward and they soon clustered round new leaders like Bipin Chandra Pal, Brahmabandhab Upadhyay and Satis Chandra Mukherji."[36]

But neither the propaganda of the Extremist leaders nor the grudging recognition forced by them upon the Congress could save the scheme of National Education. Apart from the causes mentioned above, another factor operated towards its decline. This was hinted by Arabinda in a speech at his farewell meeting in the National College, mentioned above. The national movement was now turned into a grim struggle for freedom, and before this mighty issue, involving a life and death struggle with the British Government, all minor issues paled into insignificance. So the movement for national education, like that for the boycott of British goods out of which originated the National movement, gave place to it which absorbed the whole energy and attention of the country.

V. SPREAD OF SWADESHI MOVEMENT OUTSIDE BENGAL.

It was not long before the *Swadeshi* movement in Bengal affected the other parts of India. The confidential Reports of the Intelligence Branch of the Government of Bengal throw very interesting light on this point. They clearly reveal that the "Boycott-Swadeshi Movement assumed an all-India character even towards the end of 1905. The progress of the movement was reported from 23 districts in the United Provinces, 15 towns in the Central Provinces, 24 towns in the Bombay Presidency, 20 districts in the Punjab and 13 districts in the Madras Presidency.

"In the Bombay Presidency the movement found its leaders in B. G. Tilak and S. M. Paranjpye as well as in Mrs. Ketkar (Tilak's daughter) and Mrs. A. V. Joshi." An active part in propagating it was taken by Vishnu Govind Bijapurkar and Mahadev Rajaram Bodas. "In the Punjab there were three prominent leaders, viz., Jopal (Jaipal ?), Ram Ganga

Ram, Pandit Chandrika Dutt of the Arya Samaj and Munshi Ram (later known as Swami Shraddhananda), a pleader of Jullunder and an Arya-Samajist. In the Madras Presidency Subrahmania Aiyar, P. Ananda Charlu and T. M. Nair were among the most enthusiastic advocates of the movement. At an important meeting held on December 2, 1905, with P. Ananda Charlu in the chair, Mr. Nair moved a resolution justifying Boycott as adopted by the Bengalis and characterizing it "as a weapon of a weak nation against a strong nation." He even cited the Irish and American examples in support of the Boycott movement.

"The movement bore special fruit in the Bombay Presidency. The tremendous increase in the damand of indigenous goods gave a great impetus to the production in the mills of Bombay and Ahmedabad which sold about 1,00,000 bales of cloth to the Calcutta merchants during August-September, 1905,—a sale six months ahead."[57] As in Bengal, religious sentiments "were sought to be exploited for the propagation of the Boyoctt-*Swadeshi* movement. From Lahore and Hardwar reports came that the *Pandas* were refusing to accept sweetmeats made of foreign sugar. In Poona leaflets in Marathi were found pasted in public places urging men to boycott the foreign goods in the name of religion."[58] At a meeting held at Puri 100 itinerant *Sadhus* pledged themselves to the "propagation of the Swadeshi ideology throughout India. Besides, at a meeting held in the Puri Jagannath Temple Hall, the *Pandas* resolved on boycotting foreign articles and on using countrymade goods.[59]

The idea of national education caught the imagination of the whole of India. All-India nationalist leaders like Bal Gangadhar Tilak and Lala Lajpat Rai propagated the idea. During the period from 1906 to 1909 national education made good progress outside Bengal, particularly in Berar and in the Presidencies of Bombay and Madras. "At the Second District Conference held at Satara in the Bombay Presidency in the third week of March, 1908, a resolution on the subject of National Education was unanimously passed. At about the same time was held the District Conference at Poona in which a strongly worded resolution in favour of National Education was adopted. 'Bal Gangadhar Tilak made a very stirring speech

in moving the resolution. He spoke of National Education as the only means of the elevation of the new generation and generating in them sublime aspirations and genuine patriotism of a superior type. He hoped that at no distant date National Education would find strong advocates in all parts of the country and among all communities.' The resolution was supported by Proof. Limaye of the Fergussion College who commented that "the only object of education must be regeneration of the country."[60] By the middle of 1909 the Bombay Presidency had two Secondary National Schools, namely the Samartha Vidyalaya[60a] of Telegaon Dabhada in the Poona District and the Maharashtra Vidyalaya, Poona, the students of both of which were taught according to the syllabus of the National Council of Education, Calcutta, and took its examinations. In Berar there was a National School at Yeotmal.

Influenced by the ideas and activities of the N. C. E., Bengal, the townsmen of Masulipatam, in a public meeting held on November 17, 1907, resolved to establish a National College for imparting education,- -Literary, Scientific and Technical—on national lines and under national control. An executive Committee of thirteen members was then set up to devise ways and means to form an "Andhra National Council of Education" and to found an Andhra National University in the Madras Presidency. After a year and a half's persevering efforts; the scheme was brought within easy reach of completion. A further step in the direction of National Education was taken in 1909 when the Model National College was opened at Masulipatam on 1st July by the Andhra National Council of Education.[61] It was a technical institute. A Secondary National School was started at Rajahmundry in January, 1908. This was the first National School in Southern India and the people gratefully acknowledged their indebtedness to the National Council of Education. Rashbehari Ghosh, while proceeding to Madras to attend the Congress Session, received at the Rajahmundry station a welcome address from about 200 citizens, which contained the following :

"We highly appreciate the noble work you have done for the progress of the motherland. The support you have given to the Swadeshi Movement by establishing the "Bande

Mataram'' Match Factory.....and above all, the material and intellectual help you gave to the cause of National Education as President of the National Council of Education, Calcutta, all these are worthy of the highest praise.''[62] This small incident illustrates how the spirit of *Swadeshi* movement was leavening the whole of India.

The United Provinces also followed suit and Ajodhyanath National High School, proposel to be started in Allahabad in 1908, was affiliated to the National Council of Education, Calcutta.

In the ''Bombay Provincial Conference held at Dhulia the resolution on National Education was unanimously passed. The interest taken in National Education by the people of Bombay was further manifest in their financial contributions by charity shows to the funds of the National Council of Education, Bengal.....Arabinda Ghose placed at the disposal of the Council the sum of Rs. 378-8-1½p. 'put in his hands at Bombay by the *Maharashtra Natak Mandali* **and** *Patankar Sangit Mandali* which organised benefit performances in aid of the National Council of Education, Bengal.''[63] The programme of national Education, a bye-product of the *Swadeshi* movement, thus forged a link of unity for the whole of India. It was a golden link wrought by the common desire to serve the motherland based on high ideals of nationalism and partriotism.

VI. REIGN OF TERROR.

The four-fold ramification of the *Swadeshi* movement—industrial, educational, cultural and political—and its spread all over India unnerved the Government of India. It was not long before they realized that a local movement for removing a local grievance was being slowly, but steadily, developed into an all-India national movement against British rule. Lord Minto found it difficult to kill the hydra-headed monster let out of the basket of his predecessor, Lord Curzon. The situation was rendered worse by the freaks and pranks of Bampfylde Fuller whom Lord Curzon had appointed the Lieutenant-Governor of the newly created Province of East Bengal and Assam. Far from conciliating the Hindus of East Bengal, who

were sorely aggrieved over the Partition and formed the nucleus of discontent and disaffection, Fuller alienated them by his ill-concealed favouritism to the Muslims. The Boycott and *Swadeshi* irritated the Government and it took stern repressive measures to put them down. But these very measures more and more inflamed the people and strengthened their determination to carry on the movement in the teeth of the Government opposition. As mentioned above, there ensued an undeclared and undignified war between the people and their Government.

Government repression was not directed merely against picketing and educational institutions to which reference has been made above. Sometimes events took an ugly turn and Government brutality appeared in a naked form. This may be illustrated by the history of the District of Barisal which, under the leadership of Aswini Kumar Datta, who was revered by the local people almost as a saint, proved to be the strongest centre of *Swadeshi* and Boycott movements. Aswini Babu resolved to take this opportunity to make Barisal a vanguard of the great national movement of which he had a vision long ago. The Government was equally determined to destroy this strong citadel of the enemy by any means. The *Swadeshi* and Boycott movements had tremendous success in the whole district. "Throughout October, and especially during the Puja Holidays", wrote the *Statesman*, "would-be buyers of *bideshi* (foreign) goods had no peace. Meetings were held everywhere, the town and district rang with cries of '*Bande Mataram*', and in some places the unruly element got out of hand."[64] The Proclamation issued by Aswini Babu and others on November 7, 1905, appealing to the local people to support *Swadeshi* movement, has already been quoted.[64a] The Lieutenant-Governor denounced it as a 'Proclamation' which only the Sovereign or his representative was empowered to issue ; "he found it to be seditious and condemned the proposed 'people's associations' as 'Committees of Public Safety', the appointment of which was an impertinence." When five distinguished gentlemen of the town wished to offer a word of explanation, Mr. Fuller told them firmly that he would not listen to any reply and insisted upon the instant withdrawal of the appeal.

After the interview was over, the five gentlemen of Barisal addressed the following note to the Lieutenant-Governor's Private Secretary :

"Sir, We have the honour to state that as His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor is of opinion that our appeal of the 21st 'Kartic' 1312 B. S. (7th November, 1905) contains certain expressions that may tend to lead people to commit breaches of peace, we withdraw the same and request the favour of your communicating it to His Honor." On receipt of this the District Magistrate, Mr. Jack. issued a notification stating that 'Babu Aswini Kumar Dutt and others had withdrawn the appeal because they had understood that the appeal was seditious and provocative of breaches of the peace. This misinterpretation of the note of the Barisal leaders to Mr. Fuller's Private Secretary as tantamount to the withdrawal of the document (appeal) itself, instead of as a withdrawal of the expressions objected to, was characterised even by the *Statesman's* correspondent as "the initial mistake made by Mr. Jack." Aswini Babu at once wrote to Mr. Jack, stating that the reason for their withdrawal was only to show respect to Sir Bampfylde and requesting Mr. Jack "to correct the mischievous imputation made in his notification." As no reply to this letter was obtained, Aswini Babu thereupon, after giving Mr. Jack due notice, brought a suit for defamation."[65] The suit was decreed against Mr. Jack for Rs. 120 with costs.

In the meantime things in Barisal were going from bad to worse. It was alleged that the Hindus maintained a hostile attitude towards the Europeans and Muslims. According to Police Reports there were more than sixty instances of Muslim purchasers of foreign goods being interfered with by boycotters. As an evidence of the unfriendly spirit towards the Europeans it was pointed out that a Settlement Officer, down with fever in camp, could not induce anyone to provide a palanquin for him. Two cases of assault of Europeans were also reported. One of these concerned the District Magistrate Mr. Streatfield when he went to Banaripara. On the night of his arrival there a disturbance had happened in the village and the Magistrate ordered the expulsion of three boys and a teacher from the Banaripara Union Institution, alleging that they were implicated in it.

Appeals were made to the Magistrate by a number of boys for the reconsideration of the order, and on his refusal to reopen the question, some clods of earth or other missiles were thrown in his direction. "The outcome of this affair was a telegram to the Lieutenant-Governor, who was then at Agra with Lord Curzon, the despatch of the Gurkhas to Barisal, and throughout the town, a lamentation which has continued ever since,"—so wrote the correspondent of the *Statesman* who had gone to Barisal on a tour of inspection on November 29, 1905. He further added that "Mr. Fuller himself arrived, with the Gurkhas, on the 25th, and left on the following day"

As Barisal took a prominent part in this agitation, Punitive Police were posted at various places, and Gurkhas were imported into the town for putting down the movement. Some of their atrocities are mentioned below :

(1). A house was pulled down because *Bande Mataram* was written on one of the posts of the house.

(2). A boy of 10 or 11 years was dragged to the whipping triangle before the Collectorate Court and bound and flogged for singing *Bande Mataram* while sitting inside the kitchen of his house.

(3). The shop-keepers had to supply to the Gurkhas all articles without any payment.

(4). Two confectioners were severely wounded for refusing to remove a *Swadeshi* notification on their shops.

Mr. Streatfield was succeeded by Mr. Jack, mentioned above in connection with the Defamation case. As soon as he assumed office, the horrors of Gurkha outrages were let loose upon the Hindus of Barisal and a veritable reign of terror set in. It was not confined to the town of Barisal, but spread to villages in the interior. Wild and exaggerated accounts from the people, and the flat denial of the Government, make it difficult to ascertain the exact truth, but two independent and impartial accounts may be quoted to give a fairly accurate idea of what actually happened.

The first is the report of the special correspondent of the *Statesman* of Calcutta. After making "the most diligent

inquiries into the conduct of the Gurkhas'', the correspondent summed up as follows the chief complaints against them :

(a) that they had paraded the bazar ;

(b) that they had refused proper payment for the goods taken and in some cases assaulted the shop-keepers ;

(c) that they had entered the precincts of private houses and belaboured many innocent persons, in some cases inflicting dangerous injuries ;

(d) that on the night of Thursday, November 23rd, they were let loose and went through the town ''like a tornado''

The correspondent held that the evidence available was ''more than sufficient to prove that the Gurkhas had much abused their office. There were in all nearly a dozen cases for trespass and assault against the Gurkhas pending.'' He further stated as follows : ''The actual evils of the Gurkha irruption have been exaggerated ; but there is no denying that their presence has struck terror into the minds of the Hindu population. It is not true, as some would have us believe, that one-third of the inhabitants have fled from the town, but it is perfectly true that peaceable folk, after the affair of last Thursday week, are in mortal fear of what the Gurkhas may do should they chance to make another sortie. The people keep indoors after nightfall, many of them do not seem greatly inclined to venture out during the day.''[66]

Mr. Nevinson, the special correspondent of the *Daily News* of London, who visited Bengal duing 1907-8, and has given an over-all picture of Fuller's regime in East Bengal, practically supports the correspondent of the *Statesman*. After referring to the rude treatmeat meted out to Aswini Babu and others, mentioned above, he continues :

''But Barisal's punishment has not been exhausted. A number of respectable men have been ordered to leave the town within a fortnight, their offence being that they have taken a prominent part in the popular protest against the partition. Several companies of Gurkha military police have been quartered on the people, and are everywhere entering into private houses and acting after a fashion which in almost any other part of India would have resulted in dangerous rioting.'' [67]

But though Barisal was the worst sufferer, the Government

terrorism was not confined to this district. Magistrates in other districts threatened the people that if t hey did not give up selling *Swadeshi* goods and deal in British goods, they would bring Gurkhas. A District Magistrate was so infuriated by the cry of *'Bande Mataram'* that he humiliated a number of elderly and highly respectable gentlemen by appointing them special constables. Numerous cases were instituted against preachers of boycott. There were several cases of dismissal of Government employees for the alleged offence of taking part in the *Swadeshi* movement. In Barisal alone 66 clerks were dismissed for connection with *Swadeshi*.

The repressive measures adopted by the Government, such as *lathi* charge against urarmed groups, particularly students, stationing of Gurkha soldiers in towns and villages as a punitive measure, prosecutions and persecutions on the most flimsy grounds, and various other measures, referred to above, for humiliating respectable citizens, created a reign of terror and gave a rude shock to those who had faith in the British sense of justice and fair play. Fuller's regime was openly talked about as one of mediaeval barbarism. The climax was reached on the occasion of the Bengal Provincial Conference at Barisal, to which detailed reference will be made later. The following over-all picture of Fuller's regime given by Mr. Nevinson is by no means an exaggeration of facts.

"By a succession of orders and circulars Mr. Fuller has taken away the right of public meeting. The police are authorised to treat as criminals any student or other person who may so far forget himself as to shout "Bande Mataram" (Hail, Motherland !) in the street. Under the pretext of guarding against a breach of the peace, which was never threatened, the recalcitrant gentry of Rangpore, who refused to join in an address to Mr. Fuller, have been ordered to act as special constables, to 'drill with belt & baton' by the side of ordinary policemen, and to bring daily information regarding 'disloyal movements' in the town. To the credit of Rangpore it must be added that these gentlemen declined to obey these preposterous and humiliating orders,—preposterous because they are not according to the law, and humiliating because they were obviously designed to punish them for their inconvenient shows of independence—and

they have been threatened with prosecution which they have cheerfully undertaken to face.''[67a]

Serajgunge had also a fair share of the woes. An Anglo-Indian correspondent who visited the place wrote : "The Lieutenant-Governor proceeded on his journey, and on the 4th, 5th and 6th December, the Assam policemen took their stand in various quarters of the town and beat indiscriminately with their belts every one who passed by. On the 4th the Magistrate received a deputation of protest, which included the Government pleader, and informed them that he had reason to believe they were collecting a body of lathials to resist the police. He was assured that he was entirely mistaken, and an undertaking was given to him to use every endeavour to keep the peace. The assaults of the police were not discontinued however. In order (as one may suppose) to prevent subsequent identification of an inconvenient kind, the local police were employed to point out various individuals prominently connected with the boycott movement, and they were thereupon promptly beaten with belts by the Assam constables. Many respectable men, who were passing along the streets, were subjected to this treatment which makes one wonder whether we are really discussing an occurrence in British India or in Russia''[68]

In order to prevent the news of the tyrannies from reaching the public the telegraph offices refused to accept press telegrams. Mr. Nevinson notes that the "fact is admitted by the telegraph authorities in Calcuta, and the result is that correspondents are being dispatched by the principal journals to ascertain the truth, to which Mr. Fuller appears to be so unwilling to accord publicity.''[69]

It is unnessary to give more details about the veritable reign or terror inaugurated by Mr. Fuller which gained such notoriety, even in U. K., that the *Manchester Guardian* was constrained to comment : "It is doubtful if Russia can afford a parallel to this petty-fogging tyranny''.[70] But no picture of the reign of terror would be complete without a reference to the incidents connected with the Provincial Conference at Barisal.

The Provincial Conference was being annually held in Bengal since 1888. In 1906 the Conference was to be held at Barisal on April 14 and 15 with Abdul Rasul, a Muslim Barrister, as

President. When the delegates from Calcutta and Dacca reached Barisal by steamers on the evening of 13 April, they were confronted with an awkward situation which Surendra Nath Banerji explains as follows :—

"The cry of *Bande-Mataram* was forbidden in the streets of Barisal, and indeed of all the towns in East Bengal. We held the order to be illegal, and we had fortified ourselves with competent legal opinion. Were we to submit to arbitrary authority, which was not countenanced by the law ? Self-respect forbade submission. But the Barisal leaders had entered into an understanding with the althorities, by which they agreed to abstain from crying *Bande-Mataram* in the public streets, in welcoming the delegates. Were we bound by this agreemnt ? The younger and more ardent section among the delegates were in favour of shouting *Bande-Mataram* despite the agreement. A compromise, however, was effected, which was readily acquiesced in and was acceptable to all parties. It was urged that the Barisal people were our hosts, and we were their guests, and that we should, if possible, do nothing that would compromise their position. Their compact with the authorities should b respcted ; but it was equally binding upon the delegates to vindicate the legal right, which they undoubtedly possessed, of uttering the cry in the public streets against the arbitrary order of the Government of East Bengal. The agreement of the Barisal leaders was limited to not uttering the cry on the occasion of welcoming the delegates, it did not go further It was therefore settled, with their full concurrence on board the steamer, that the understanding with the Barisal leaders should be respected, but that on all other occasions during the Conference we should utter the cry as if no Government order to the contrary had been issued. This being agreed to, the delegates landed in the evening."[71] It was decided at a conference of the leading delegates on the morning of the 14th "that the delegates should meet in the compound of Raja's *haveli*, and march in procession to the Panda! where the Provincial Conference was to be held, crying *Bande-Mataram* as they went along. It was apprehended that the police would interfere and even use force ; but it was strictly enjoined that in no circumstances were the delegates to retaliate and that they were

not to carry *lathis* or even walking-sticks with them."[72] The procession, led by the President and his wife, an English lady, in a carriage, and Surendra Nath Banerji, Motilal Ghosh and Bhupendra Nath Basu on foot, started at 2-30 p.m. The police, armed with regulation *lathis*, was strongly in evidence, and there was an Assistant Superintendent of Police on horseback. What followed is thus described by Surendra Nath : "We were allowed to pass unmolested. It was when the younger delegates, the members of the Anti-Circular Society, emerged from the *haveli* into the public street that the whole programme of the police was developed, and the attack was begun. They were struck with regulation *lathis* (fairly thick sticks, six feet long) ; the *Bande-Mataram* badges that they wore were torn off. Some of them were badly hurt, and one of them, Chittaranjan Guha, was thrown into a tank full of water, in which, if he had not been rescued, he would probably have found a watery grave.

"I turned back at once, followed by Babu Motilal Ghose and one or two others. As I was coming along, I met Mr. Kemp, Superintendent of Police. I said to him, 'Why are you thrashing our men ? If they have done anything, I am the person to be punished. I am responsible. Arrest me if you like.' 'You are my prisoner, sir', was the prompt reply of the Police Superintendent. At this stage Mr. Motilal Ghose came forward and said, 'Arrest me also.' To that Mr. Kemp's reply was, 'My instructions are to arrest Mr. Banerjee alone.' Evidently my arrest had been pre-arranged ; but that is another story.

"This part of the episode closed with my arrest. I was now a prisoner in police custody. Turning to Mr. Bhupendra Nath Basu, who was close by, I said, 'You had better proceed with the business of the Conference without me. Let it not be stopped or suspended'. My instructions were scrupulously followed. The excitement and indignation were great ; but the Conference went on to transact the business that was before it as if nothing had happened."[73]

Surendra Nath was taken by Mr. Kemp to the house of the Magistrate, Mr. Emerson. He was accompanied by Aswini Babu, a local Zamindar named Biharilal Roy, and Kaliprasanna

Kavyavisharad, the renowned editor of the *Hitavadi*, the most popular Calcutta weekly of the day. Kavyavisharad was clad in *dhoti* and *chadar* (orthodox Bengali dress). As soon as he crossed the threshold of Mr. Emerson's room, Mr. Emerson cried out, "Get out", and he had to obey. Surendra Nath's narrative continues : "My other two friends accompanied me into the room without objection and took their seats on the chairs that they found there. I was about to follow their example and had laid my hand on a dilapidated rattan chair, intending to take my seat, when the magistrate shouted out 'You are a prisoner. You cannot take your seat. You must stand'. I said in reply, 'I have not come here to be insulted by you in your house. I expect to be treated with courtesy and consideration.'

"Mr. Emerson was angry. He forthwith drew up contempt proceedings against me, and asked me to plead. Of course, I pleaded not guilty and I prayed for time for my defence. There was sitting with the magistrate, while all this was going on, a European gentleman who, I afterwards learnt, was Mr. Lees, then Magistrate of Noakhali. He asked me to apologize and end the matter. I said, 'What have I to apologize for ? I have done nothing for which I feel I ought to express my regret. I was fined two hundred rupees for contempt.

"The police case was then taken up. Mr. Kemp gave his evidence. He was, I think, the only witness in the case. I was charged with being a member of a procession which had not taken out a license, and with uttering a cry forbidden by competent authority. I pleaded not guilty and prayed for time to cross-examine Mr. Kemp and produce witnesses. The prayer was rejected. I was again fined two hundred rupees.

"The fine being paid, I returned to the Conference, which was then sitting. As I entered, accompanied by my friends, we witnessed a unique scene, the whole audience rising to a man, shouting *Bande-Mataram* at the top of their voices. For several minutes the proceedings were suspended and were resumed on our taking our seats on the platform.

"Presently there appeared on the platform Babu Monoranjan Guha, accompanied by his son, Chittaranjan Guha, with a

bandage round his forehead, to tell the delegates the story of the assault committed by the police upon this young man..... Chittaranjan had been attacked by the police with their regulation *lathis* and thrown into a tank full of water. The assault was continued, notwithstanding the helpless condition of the boy, who offered no resistance of any kind, but shouted *Bande-Mataram* with every stroke of the *lathi*. It was a supreme effort of resignation and submission to brutal force without resistance and without questioning. The spectacle of father and son, standing side by side on the platform, the father relating the story, the son bearing witness to it by the marks of violence on his person, was a sight ever to be remembered and it was afterwards transferred to canvas and was one of the most popular pictures in the Calcutta Exhibition of 1906, which was opened by Lord Minto.

"The Conference broke up in the evening ; and as the delegates dispersed to their homes they shouted the forbidden cry of *Bande-Mataram* in the streets of Barisal. The police did not interfere. Presumably they thought they had done a sufficient days s work, and left the delegates alone.

"But the story of the act of repression, one of the darkest in the annals of the defunct Government of East Bengal, was not yet closed. The Conference met on the following day, and was transacting its business in the usual way, when Mr. Kemp, District Superintendent of Police, entered the *pandal*. He walked up to the platform and told the President that the Conference must disperse, unless he was prepared to give a guarantee that the delegates would not shout *Bande-Mataram* in the streets after the Conference was over. The President, after consulting the delegates, declined to give the guarantee. Mr. Kemp then read out the order of the magistrate directing the dispersal of the Conference under Section 144 of the Criminal Procedure Code. A wave of indignation passed over the Conference. The delegates were in no mood to submit. Mr. J. Chaudhuri and other leaders appealed to them to respect authority, however arbitrary the fiat might seem to them, and they responded to the appeal. Through these exciting times, the discipline of our people and their readiness to submit to the

advice of their leaders was conspicuously in evidence and largely contributed to the success of the movement.

"The delegates left their seats, moving out in files into the public street, shouting *Bande-Mataram*. At every stage they sought to vindicate the legality of that cry. All left, save and except one and one alone. That was Mr. Krishna Kumar Mitra, editor of *Sanjibani*. Like the senators of old when Brennus was entering Rome with his barbarian horde, he remained in his seat and would not more. Determination was painted upon his features; his face was red with indignation. He was prepared to face the consequences of the disobedience of authority. We argued, prayed and protested ; and it was with the utmost difficulty that we persuaded him at last to leave the *pandal*."[74]

Thus ended the Barisal Conference of 1906. Fuller stated, after he left India, that the 'Barisal business' was the only real article of charge against him and he did not deny it to be 'very bad'.[74a] As to the conduct of the Police in beating the members of the procession on 14th April, Surendra Nath has made the following observation :

"These young men had done nothing ; they had not even before the assault uttered what to the Government of East Bengal was an obnoxious cry, that of *Bande-Mataram*. The head and front of their offence was that they were going along the public streets in a procession, causing no inconvenience or obstruction to anybody. It was after they had been attacked that they lustily shouted *Bande-Mataram*, and the air re-echoed with the cry. It was difficult to conceive a more wanton and unprovoked assault. The processionists, if they had committed any offence might have been arrested ; and the procession itself might have been broken up if it was thought desirable ; but that did not suit the authorities, and I have no hesitation in saying, and it was the verdict of contemporary opinion, that a preconceived plan had been arranged, which was a part of the policy of terrorism that was being systematically followed in East Bengal, in the hope that the agitation against the Partition would be crushed out of existence. It was a vain hope. Repression failed here, as it has failed wherever it has been tried. It served only to strengthen the popular forces and to deepen the popular determination."[75]

Most people would undoubtedly endorse these remarks. The effect of the Government persecution was seen on the return journey of Surendra Nath two days after the Conference. At every station where the steamer or the train touched, crowds of people had gathered to see Surendra Nath and to take the dust of his feet. When he arrived at Calcutta before daybreak on 18 April, a huge crowd— estimated to be about ten thousand strong—had assembled to welcome him. The excited crowd unhorsed the carriage of Surendra Nath and drew it from Sealdah Railway Station to College Square, where he had to address thousands in those early hours of the morning. But this was only the beginning. The storm that broke out in Barisal raged with cyclonic fury all over Bengal. The situation is thus described by Surendra Nath :

"College Square had its meetings almost daily. The mofussil were not slow in following the lead of Calcutta. Indeed, the reports of the proceedings of the Barisal Police flew like wildfire and deeply stirred popular feeling. Men indifferent to public movements took the *Swadeshi* vow and practised it in their daily lives. Recluses buried amid their books emerged from their seclusion and eagerly joined the *Swadeshi* and anti-Partition demonstrations. A monster meeting, second only to that of the 16th October, was held at the house of Rai Pashupatinath Bose. It was an open-air demonstration and the spacious courtyard was filled to suffocation. Rai Narendranath Sen, the most moderate among the political leaders of Bengal, was called to the chair. He described the Barisal incident as 'hardly having any parallel in the history of British India.' 'The Press and the platform,' he said, 'are the safety-valves of popular discontent,' and he added that 'whenever they have been sought to be suppressed, anarchy has intervened.' The words were prophetic, as subsequent events have shown."[76]

But far more significant was the reaction of the Barisal Conference outside Bengal. Telegrams expressing sympathy for the sufferers poured in from Lahore, Madras and Poona, There was no doubt that the "proceedings of the authorities in connexion with the Barisal Conference created a sense of indignation among the educated community not only in Bengal but also outside that province. In Madras a crowded and inflential

public meeting was held. Over ten thousand people assembled in the open air on the Esplanade. 'Long before the hour fixed for the meeting', says the report, 'people began to come in streams, shouting *Bande-Mataram.*' The meeting recorded a resolution protesting against the high-handed proceedings of the Barisal authorities as 'a flagrant infringement of the liberties of British subjects, and a subversion of the principles of constitutional government.' A cablegram was sent to the Secretary of State for India by the meeting, calling his immediate attention 'to the arrest of a great popular leader and the dispersal by the police force of an annual conference of several thousand members, praying for sympathetic orders for allaying excitement and the restoration of public faith in British freedom and the rights of citizenship, and the punishment of the officers responsible." Surendra Nath has rightly commented in this connection : "Bad rulers serve a useful purpose in the evolution of nations. They stir up the sleeping lion from his torpor ; they stimulate public spirit and foster national unity."[77]

The Barisal Conference must ever be regarded as a memorable episode in the history of the *Swadeshi* movement. It served as the baptism of fire so far as any organized political body was concerned, and called forth the latent psirit of sturdy nationalism and brave defiance of autocracy and tyranny which henceforh marked every stage of India's struggle for freedom. At long last there emerged a political issue round which the people could rally and for which they were prepared to suffer and sacrifice. The ideals of new nationalism preached by its high priests like Tilak, Arabinda, and Lajpat Rai assumed concrete shape, which may be regarded as the precursor of the Civil Disobedience Movement of Mahatma Gandhi. But there were other momentous consequences. It made the *Swadeshi* movement an all-India issue which had its repercussion on the Indian National Congress and the alignment of Indian political parties. The reign of terror which culminated in the Police outrage on the Barisal Conference was the signal for the rise of terrorism in Bengal. What Arabinda Ghose and other leaders of the so-called terrorist party had failed to achieve, was done for them by Mr. Fuller and Mr. Emerson.

Lastly, these two high officials put Surendra Nath on a

high pedestal. What they really did was to put a crown of thorn on the head of this uncrowned King of Bengal. He proved to be the greatest Moderate leader which the *Swadeshi* movement had thrown out, and for some time he secured a position and popularity which no Indian political leader had enjoyed before.

The tyranical method of administration and the freaks and pranks of Fuller and his underlings created a veritable reign of terror in East Bengal which did not end with his departure. This, as well as the new spirit engendered in Bengal by the *Swadeshi* movement, led to a severe criticism of Government both in the press and on the platform, as mentioned above. The Government first came down upon the *Bande Mataram*, a daily in Calcutta edited by Arabinda Ghose; and the chief organ of the new Nationalism and the Extremist Party. Arabinda was charged with sedition in August, 1907. But as no evidence was forthcoming that he was the editor of the paper, he was acquitted, though the printer was convicted and sentenced to imprisonment. There was an interesting episode in connection with this trial. Bepin Chandra Pal, the great political leader and an intimate associate of Arabinda, was called by the Government as a witness in the case to prove Arabinda's association with the paper. It was, of course, well known that Arabinda was the heart and soul of the paper, and no one knew it better than B. C. Pal. But he was unwilling either to tell a lie or to harm Arabinda in any way. B. C. Pal, therefore, refused to give evidence, as in his opinion the prosecution was injurious to the interests of the country. He cheerfully offered to accept the penalty for his conduct and was sentenced to six months' simple imprisonment.

Brahmabandhab Upadhyaya, the editor of the *Sandhya*, a very popular vernacular daily in Calcutta, was also prosecuted on a charge of sedition. There is no doubt that his vigorous attacks, couched in a quaint humorous style easily understood by one and all, caused a great incitement to popular discontent, and created strong disaffection against the Government. Brahmabandhab knew this and refused to defend himself—the forerunner of what became a regular practice during the days of Gandhian Non-co-operation. He propounded the philosophy

of his Non-co-operation in a written statement submitted to the Court which contained the following :

"I do not want to take part in the trial, because I do not believe that, in carrying out my humble share of the God-appointed mission of *Swaraj* I am in any way accountable to the alien people, who happen to rule over us and whose interest is, and must necessarily be, in the way of our true national development."[78]

Brahmabandhab also boasted that no foreign Court would be able to punish him. Curiously enough, this proved to be only too true, for he died before the conclusion of the trial.

The editor of the *Yugantar*, the organ of the revolutionary party, the nature of whose writings has been mentioned elsewhere, was also prosecuted several times, and on each occasion sentenced to imprisonment along with the printer.

The *Swadeshi* spirit, however, was not damped by these repressive measures. The programme of Boycott and *Swadeshi* continued, and the first anniversary of the Partition day on 16th October, 1906, was widely celebrated both in Eastern and Western Bengal. At Dacca six processions were taken out and Hindu and Muhammadans closed their shops. The public meeting was presided over by a member of the Nawab family. At Mymensingh the peoples' proclamation was read and the *Swadeshi* vow renewed at a meeting presided over by a Muslim pleader. Similarly, processions were taken out and meetings were held at Chittagong, Noakhali, Pabna, Faridpur and other places. Some of these meetings were presided over by Muslims. The main features of this celebration of the anniversary were closing of shops, *Nagar Sankirtan*, processions, *Rakhi Bandhan*, renewal of *Swadeshi* vow, reading of the peoples' proclamation and public meetings. In some places special prayes were offered by Hindus and Muslims for reunion of Bengal. In some places *Sankirtan* parties paraded the main roads, singing anti-Partition and *Swadeshi* songs in which even Muhammadans joined. The East Bengal and Assam Government were very anxious that some demonstrations should be held in favour of Partition as a counter-blast to the anti-Partition demonstrations. So they instigated the Muslims to hold such meetings, and even Muslim Government servants were engaged

in arranging such pro-Partition demonstrations ; but in this they were not very successful. The official report states : "Though it is the easiest matter in the world to collect a certain number of pleaders and school boys together to agitate for or against any possible matter which may interest the Hindu community, it is a very different matter when the Mohammedans are concerned." On the second anniversary of the Boycott, meetings were held on 7th August in almost every district in Bengal ; many college buildings were illuminated and students displayed fireworks with shouts of *Bande Mataram*. There were the usual processions, closing of shops and illuminations.

The *Swadeshi* and Boycott movements were not only maintained but considerably reinforced by several factors. One of these was the visit of notable all-India leaders like Tilak, Khaparde, Lajpat Rai and others to Bengal, and this demontration of all-India sympathy was a great encouragement to the Bengalis. The tours of leaders like Bepin Chandra Pal over the whole of Bengal, particularly Eastern Bengal, were also very important in keeping up the spirit. The growth of *Samitis* or associations and volunteer organizations served as an important factor in carrying on the movements in spite of repressions of the Government. But, above all, the spirit of the Bengalis was kept up by a sudden literary outburst in the shape of songs, poems, dramas, and *yatras* (a sort of popular dramatic performance) which bred a new spirit of nationalism and patriotism. It gave a new impetus to the patriotic sentiment of the Bengalis and sustained them in their struggle against the Government. Indeed, it would be hardly any exaggeration to say that the whole of Bengal was carried off its feet by the new enthusiasm created by Bengali literature. The influence of the press was also a significant factor. The writings in the *Bande Mataram* edited by Arabinda, *Sandhya* edited by Brahmabandhab Upadhyaya, and *Jugantar*, to which reference has been made above, practically revolutionized the political attitude of Bengal. A new national feeling was created which spurned at every obstacle in the attainment of its objects. The signs of the times were such that even he who ran could easily read them. Thus we find it stated in October, 1906, in the official reports, that the Boycott movement has practically ousted the anti-Partition

agitation : "It is now urged by the leaders that the removal of the partition should not affect the maintenance of the boycott, and the *Swadeshi* movement should continue." According to a report of the District Magistrate of Pabna, "the Swadeshi movement has recently developed into a general movement for the self-government of India." The official reports also admit that the apparent failure of all constitutional agitation to move the Government, and bitterness caused by the anti-*Swadeshi* measures adopted by the Government, increased the impatience of a section of people and leaders, and they quoted the following passage from the *New India*, edited by B. C. Pal, as typical of the new spirit : "If the Government stoops to Russian methods, people have no alternative but to imitate those plans and schemes of self-development which have created an impassivity in Russia. They can organize strikes and by mere passiveness bring the administration to a standstill." This gradual development of *Swadeshi* and its influence upon the politics of the country will be dealt with in a separate section. But before turning to it we must describe in some detail the general attitude of the Muslims towards the Partition, Boycott and *Swadeshi*, as it has a very important bearing on the subsequent political development.

VII. HINDU-MUSLIM RIOTS.

At the early stages of the anti-Partition movement it was supported by the Muslims of East Bengal. Even the Nawab of Dacca was at first disposed to stand by the Hindu *Zamindars*. A Muslim *Zamindar* of Faridpur warned his co-religionists not to believe that the Partition would benefit the Muhammadans by creating a Muhammadan Province. Another Muslim *Zamindar* cordially co-operated with Aswini Kumar Dutta of Barisal. Mr. A Rasul was a staunch *Swadeshist* and presided over the Barisal Conference held in April, 1906, to which reference has been made above. Abdul Halim Ghaznavi of Mymensingh, Abul Kasem of Burdwan, Liakat Hussain, and many other prominent leaders among Muslims were enthusiastic supporters of the *Swadeshi* movement. Large number of Muslims took part in the *Swadeshi* meetings from the very beginning. They also

attended the Shivaji festival and the meetings held to honour those who suffered in the country's cause.

Even in *mofussil* areas, particularly Barisal, the Muslim masses joined the *Swadeshi* movement and were inspired by folk songs composed for the purpose. They joined *Bande Mataram* processions carried *Bande Mataram* flags, and attended public meetings addressed by Hindu leaders. The mingled shouts of *Alla-ho-Akbar* and *Bande Mataram* by both Hindus and Musalmans formed a characteristic feature of these meetings and processions.

But this is only one side of the picture. A section of Muslims supported the Partition scheme from the very beginning. The Government was, naturally, very eager to enlist the support of these Muslims against the Hindus. The policy was initiated by Lord Curzon when he visited East Bengal in February, 1904, and induced Nawab Salimullah of Dacca to declare himself in favour of Partition. Though there were a few members of the Nawab family of Dacca who opposed the Partition and joined the *Swadeshi* movement, Nawab Salimullah became the leader of Muhammadan opposition to the anti-Partition and Boycott movement in East Bengal and Assam, and actively helped the Government in fighting the *Swadeshi* movement in the new Province. In return for these political and public services the Government of India granted a loan of Rs. 14 lakhs to the Nawab at a very low rate of interest.

Under the influence of the British Government insidious attempts were made to wean away the Muslims from the Hindu agitators. As already noted above, there were counter-demonstrations in support of Partition. An official report dated 20 September, 1906, expressed the fear (or hope) that the Muhammadans, who have been sorely provoked, might cause some trouble. This pious or rather impious wish was soon fulfilled. Gradually, under the aegis of the Government, the Muslim opposition grew and took a definite shape. In December, 1906, a Mohammedan Vigilance Association came into being, in order to collect evidence of the oppression committed on the Muhammadans by the *Swadeshi* agitators. But it was not the British Government alone that was responsible for the change in the Muslim attitude. Reference has been made above to the

anti-Hindu policy inaugurated by Sir Syed Ahmad at Aligarh. It culminated in the formation of the Muslim League, a rival organization to the Congress, as will be described later, in Chapter IV. The foundation of this League in Dacca on the last day of December, 1906, was the beginning of an organized opposition on the part of the Muslims to the Hindus. On the other hand, we find that a few young Muhammadans founded the 'Bengal Mohammedan Association' and 'Indian Musalman Association' in Calcutta as a counter-blast against the Mohammedan Vigilance Association and the Muslim League of Dacca.

Nevertheless, it is a well-known fact that as days passed by, the Musalmans took a more and more hostile attitude towards the Hindus and the *Swadeshi* movement sponsored by them. This attitude, deliberately encouraged under the leadership of the Nawab of Dacca, and connived at, if not instigated, by British officials, culminated in a series of outbreaks in East Bengal. There were a number of communal riots, the most serious of which were those at Comilla and Jamalpur. The depth of infamy to which the Muslim propaganda descended is best exemplified by the notorious document, known as *Lal Ishtahar*, or *Red Pamphlet*, which was the most virulent anti-Hindu proclamation and an open incitement of the Muslims against the Hindus.

The disturbances at Comilla broke out on the 4th of March, 1907, and continued for about 4 days. They synchronized with the visit of Nawab Salimullah of Daca to Comilla town to put fresh vigour into the anti-*Swadeshi* agitation. When the Nawab was being taken in a procession through the public streets, there occurred a case of assault on Hindus, and looting of a few Hindu, particularly Hindu *Swadeshi*, shops. These incidents were a signal for a general outbreak of hooliganism involving assault, looting, destruction of properties and arson. The most notable feature was the indifference and callousness of the local officials and the police. On the other hand, the Government officials were full of praise for the Muhammadans for their self-restraint. The Comilla riot was followed by various other outbreaks of a similar nature, though of less intensity. Consider able bodies of Muhammadans, armed with *lathis*, mustered from time to time and molested the Hindus. As a result there

was wide-spread panic among the Hindu minority population in East Bengal and a growing estrangement and bitterness between the two communities. The most serious disturbance broke out at Jamalpur in the District of Mymensingh. In addition to the troubles in the town started by the Muslims, in the course of which hundreds of Hindus—men and women—had to take shelter in a temple throughout the night, the riot spread to outside area. There were indiscriminate looting and molestation of Hindus in a large number of localities. We find the following in the confidential reports of the police : "The rough and turbulent Mohammedan population of the North-Western thanas, lined between the Jamuna river and the Garo Hills, were instigated by the prevailing excitement to the belief that they had an opportunity of looting with impunity. The accounts which have appeared in the Calcutta Press are exaggerated but it is unfortunately certain that a certain number of villages and huts were the subject of looting and, in some cases, of incendiarism,, and further that the greatest panic and alarm prevailed among the respectable classes." These communal riots came to be almost a normal feature in some parts of Eastern Bengal. The official version about the causes of the riots was thus summed up by Mr. Morley in reply to certain questions in the House of Commons. "The situation in Eastern Bengal", said he, "was strained owing to the bitterness existing between the Hindus and Muhammadans consequent to the attemspts made to compel Muhammadans by violence to abstain from purchasing foreign goods." In reply to this 15 Hindu leaders issued a statement which was published in the *Statesman* and other newspapers. The statement may be summed up as follows :

"The ill feeling between the Hindus and Mohammedans affects only a limited area in Eastern Bengal and is of very recent growth. Out of 13 Districts of Eastern Bengal, practically only two are in a disturbed state. The disturbances at Comilla followed by thpse at Jamalpur might be said to be the genesis of the riots. It has been demonstrated beyond the possibility of doubt that the Comilla disturbances had nothing whatever to do with the *Swadeshi* movement. They were started by the Mohammedan processionists who accompanied Nawab Salimullah of Dacca, and if the local officials had vigor-

ously dealt with the rioters at the outset, no further disturbances would have taken place. At Jamalpur again the disturbances were not due to the *Swadeshi* movement, and this is confirmed by the evidence of eye-witnesses and by the report of the special correspondent of the *Statesman* who actually visited the spot and made personal inquiries and saw everything for himself. The first information contains no reference to boycott or picketting. Mr. Beatson Bell, I. C. S., the trying Officer at Dewangunj, has observed that boycott is not the cause of the disurbances. Another Special Magistrate in the same place, himself a Muslim, observes : 'There was not the least provocation for rioting, the common object of the rioters was evidently to molest the Hindus.' In his judgment on a rioting case, "Emperor *Vs* Habil Sircar", the same Magistrate observes as follows : 'The evidence adduced on the side of the prosecution shows that the accused Habil Sircar had read over a notice to a crowd of Musalmans and had told them that the Government and the Nawab Bahadur of Dacca had passed orders to the effect that nobody would be punished for plundering and oppressing the Hindus. Soon after, the image of Kali (Hindu goddess) was broken by the Musalmans and the shops of the Hindu traders were also plundered. In some of the shops fire was set to heaps of papers by the Musalmans for the purpose of searching the shops of the Hindus by the light of the fire.....In my opinion the witnessess do not make any false statements in their evidence' etc. Mr. Barneville, I. C. S., the Sub-Divisional Officer of Jamalpur, says in his report on the Melanda hut riots, 'that some Musalmans proclaimed by beat of drum that the Government had permitted them to loot the Hindus.' In an abduction case against some Muhammadans the same Magistrate remarks 'that these outrages were due to the announcement that the Government had permitted the Mohammedans to marry Hindu widows in *Nika* form'.

"It has been reported from various places that Mohammedan Mullahs are going about amongst illiterate Mohammedans and exhorting them to rise against the Hindus. The victims of the looting and outrage have been Hndus and apart from any question of *Swadeshi* or Boycott, for the shop of Marwaree merchants containing foreign goods were also looted. The con

clusion is inevitable that the disturbances were in no way due to any forcible attempts on the part of the Hindus to compel Mohammadans by violence to abstain from purchasing foreign goods. If such were the case there would certainly have been an appreciable number of complaints in the law courts, specially having regard to the countenance that cases of this class have received from the officials ; but so far the number of cases has been insignificantly small."

The long summary of the statement of the Hindu leaders points to the conclusion that the riots were due to a deliberate design, and a carful perusal of all evidence, including the official papers, hardly leaves any doubt that the Government certainly had a great share in fomenting this Muslim frenzy against the Hindus. This view finds support in the report of Mr. R. Nathan Commissioner, Dacca Division, regarding the disturbances at Jamalpur on April 21-22, 1907.

After describing the origin of the disturbances in the *Mela* he proceeded to state that the volunteers fled and were pursued by a Muslim mob. This mob "went past the S. D. O's. bungalow, destroyed a Druga image in the Durgabari, hammered at the tin roofs and the mat walls of the Hindu houses, damaged three swadeshi stalls, pelted the cutcheries of two Zamindars. Near the cutcheries they were met by S. D. O. with a few police. The S. D. O. told them to give up their *lathis* and they gave up some and threw away others. Afterwards they dispersed ; *No arrests were made here and no names taken.* With the very small force with the S. D. O. this might have been difficult."

The excuse offered in the last line would appear to most people rather lame. There is no reason to suppose that the S.D.O. could not take down the names of the ringleaders of these lawless activities with a view to punishing them later.

It is certainly a very serious accusation against any civilized Government that they deliberately set up one class of their subjects against another in order to achieve their own selfish ends. No one should lightly bring in such a charge. It is necessary, therefore, to put together a few facts which unerringly lead to such a conclusion.

I. In the first place, the Government did not take any

step to stop the insidious anti-Hindu propaganda openly carried on by the Muslim *Mullahs* in widely spread areas. The fifteen Hindu Leaders, mentioned above, justly observed : "Who sends them and finances them is a mystery which it is the duty of Government to unravel". This the Government never did. But the complacency of the Government towards such propaganda is nowhere better shown than in their attitude towards the notorious *Red Pamphlet*.

How inflammatory the statements of the pamphlet were would appear from the following extracts :—

"The Hindus, by various stratagems, are relieving the Mahomedans of nearly the whole of the money earned by them."

"Among the causes of the degradation of Mahomedans is their association with the Hindus."

"Among the means to be adopted for the amelioration of Mahomedans, is boycotting Hindus."

"Ye Musalmans arise, awake ! Do not read in the same schools with Hindus. Do not buy anything from a Hindu shop. Do not touch any article manufactured by Hindu hands. Do not give any employment to a Hindu. Do not accept any degrading office under a Hindu. You are ignorant, but if you acquire knowledge you can at once send all Hindus to *jehannum* (hell). You form the majority of the population of this Province. Among the cultivators also you form the majority. It is agriculture that is the source of wealth. The Hindu has no wealth of his own and has made himself rich only by despoiling you or your wealth. If you become sufficiently enlightened, then the Hindus will starve and soon become Mahomedans."

"Hindus are very selfish. As the progress of Mahomedans is inimical to the self-aggrandisement of Hindus, the latter will always oppose Mahomedan progress for their selfish ends."

"Be united in boycotting Hindus. What dire mischief have they not done to us ! They have robbed us of honour and wealth. They have deprived us of our daily bread. And now they are going to deprive us of our very life."

The extracts quoted above from the *Red Pamphlet* clearly prove that it was a very mischievous and inflammatory document and was deliberately circulated amongst the Muslims in order

to stir them up against the Hindus. The exceptional lenience with which this document was allowed a large circulation, and the peculiarly soft method of dealing with the offender lend strong support to the idea of Government connivance.

Its early history is thus described in the report of Mr. Le Mesurier, Chief Secretary to the Government of Eastern Bengal and Assam. "It (The *Red Pamphlet*) appears to have been first heard of at the Mohammedan Conference at Dacca in December last, and again at the Barisal (Muslim) Educational Conference between the 29th and 31st of March. At both these places it was immediately suppressed by the responsible Mohammedans themselves. The next occasion on which it was heard of was in the beginning of May, when the *Bengalee* newspaper reported the pamphlet to be circulated in Madaripara in the Rajshahi District, and called upon Government to take measures for its suppression. Orders were issued to the S. P. in Mymensingh, Faridpur, and other districts to enquire for the pamphlet and to trace the agency by which it was issued. The S. P. of Mymensingh fell dangerously ill just at this period, and there was some delay in receiving his reply, but in the interval the Commissioner of Dacca ascertained that the author was a resident of Mymensingh, and he was accordingly sent for (? not arrested) by the D. M." Thus it is admitted by the Government that for six months no effort was made by them to find out the author of this highly inflammable pamphlet. It was not till the *Bengalee* complained about it that the Government moved in the matter. The impression sought to be created by Mr. Le Mesurier, that the pamphlet was suppressed by the Muslims themselves, is not correct, for it had a large circulation.

It is interesting to note the results of the belated efforts of the Government to seize the offender. This is revealed in the following official letter from the Government of East Bengal and Assam to the Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department.

"The man Ibrahim Khan who published, or circulated, the well-known Red Pamphlet was eventually produced before the Magistrate after some delay, due to the serious illness of the Superintendent of Police. He was called upon to show cause why proceedings should not be taken against him under section

108 in respect of this pamphlet, and after making a full disclosure of the methods used by him for disseminating it and giving a satisfactory undertaking that it should not re-issue, the proceedings against him have been suspended. Meanwhile, enquiries are being made with a view to the recovery of all possible copies of the pamphlet. It has been largely circulated by the agency of the *Mihir-O-Sudharkar* newspaper in Calcutta, which, during the fortnight, has shown a somewhat ferociously anti-Hindu tone, mingled with a tendency to abuse the Government as unduly pro-Hindu."

One would naturally like to know the punishment that was meted out to the author of this mischievous document. On this subject we have the following note from the District Magistrate of Mymensingh. "In accordance with instructions (whose instructions ?), I have to-day released Ibrahim Khan (author of the red pamphlet) on personal recognisance bond of Rs. 1000/- to appear when called on at any time during the coming year with a warning that if any further copies of the red pamphlet are issued, proceedings under Sec. 108, Cr. P. C. will be at once reinstituted. He has signed the two accompanying statements of which I have kept Bengali Copies written by himself to be placed on the record." It would be interesting to know the authority whose instruction he refers to at the beginning. The punishment (?) inflicted upon the author of the "Red Pamphlet" is particularly revealing when compared with the sentences usually awarded to Hindus for even such offence as shouting *'Bande Mataram'* or picketing without using any violence.

The authorities in Calcutta, that is, the members of the Government of India, were more or less conscious of the fact that the conduct of the local officials in these matters was not above reproach.

Sir H. A. Stuart writes : "There was, undoubtedly, for example, mismanagement at Comilla. Then again the withdrawal of the proceedings against the author of the "Red Pamphlet", will be used as evidence of the Pro-Musalman bias of the local authorities."

Mr. H. Adamson writes : "I agree that it was most injudicious to drop the case after it had been started, and so far as

I can gather from the papers, the Magistrate acted *ultra vires* in taking security, and the bond is not worth the paper that it is written on."

Lord Minto observes : "I know nothing of the actual law in this case, but when I read in another file that it had been dropped, it seemed to me very ill-judged."

II. According to judicial findings, stated above, the riots were the direct result of written notices and verbal announcements made public by beat of drums to the effect that the Government had permitted the Muslims to loot the Hindus and forcibly marry Hindu widows, and that the Government and Nawab Bahadur of Dacca passed orders that no Muslim would be punished for these outrages against the Hindus. The Government took no steps either to punish the offenders or to remove such impression from the minds of illiterate mobs. This can be easily construed as an indirect encouragement to the Muslims to rise against the Hindus.

III. The report of Mr. Nathan, quoted above, shows that the conduct of the local authorities was certainly questionable and the charge of connivance levelled against them is not without foundation. Even the high-ups in the Central Government could hardly conceal the delight which they derived from the reports of these disturbances. We quote Sir Herbert Risley on the Jamalpur incident : "If the volunteers did get hammered they have themselves to thank."[79]

IV. Mr. H. W. Nevinson, who visited India about this time, had made a few observations in his book, *The New Spirit in India*, which entirely support the view that the Government must take the principal share of blame for the unfortunate riots that took place in various parts of Eastern Bengal. As he is an impartial observer and is not likely to be prejudiced against his own countrymen, no apology is needed for making extensive quotations from his book :

'I have almost invariably found English officers and officials on the side of the Mohammedans where there is any rivalry of race or religion at all. And in Eastern Bengal this national inclination is now encouraged by the Government's open resolve to retain the Mohammedan support of the Partition by any means in its power. It was against the Hindus only that all the petty

persecution of officialdom was directed. It was they who were excluded from Government posts ; it was Hindu schools from which Government patronage was withdrawn. When Mohammedans rioted, the punitive police ransacked Hindu houses and companies of little Gurkhas were quartered on Hindu populations. It was the Hindus who in one place were forbidden to sit on the river bank. Of course, the plea was that only the Hindus were opposed to the Government's policy of dividing them from the rest of their race, so that they alone needed supprssion".[80]

Nevinson further observes : "Priestly mullahs went through the country preaching the revival of Islam and proclaiming to the villagers that the British Government was on the Mohammedan side, that the Law Courts had been specially suspended for three months, and no penalty would be exacted for violence done to Hindus, or for the loot of Hindu shops, or the abduction of Hindu widows. A Red Pamphlet was everywhere circulated, maintaining the same wild doctrines. It was seen that a large proportion of Government posts were set aside for Mohammedans and some were even kept vacant because there was no Mohammedan qualified to fill them. Sir Bampfylde Fuller said in jest that of his two wives (meaning the Moslem and Hindu section of his province) the Mohammedan was the favourite. The jest was taken in earnest and the Mussulmans genuinely believed that the British authorities were ready to forgive them all excesses".[81]

C. J. O'Donnell, M. P., refers in his book to Hindu-Musalman riots and quotes from judicial proceedings that these were engineered and the Musalmans were led to believe by public proclamation that they would not be punished for plundering and oppressing the Hindus. He also refers to a number of trials which show how English Judges were biassed against the Hindus. In one case the High Court observed :

"The method of the learned judge in dealing with the testimony of the witnesses by dividing them into two classes—Hindus and Musalmans—and accepting the evidence of one class and rejecting that of the other, is open to severe criticism."[82]

Nevinson, in a way, supported the almost unanimous view

of the Hindus that the communal riots were the direct consequence of the Partition of Bengal. He says : "Some two years after his departure from India Lord Curzon wrote to the *Times* that it was 'a wicked falsehood' to say that by the Partition he intended to carve out a Mohammedan State, to drive a wedge between Mohammedan and Hindu, or to arouse racial feuds. Certainly no one would willingly accuse another of such desperate wickedness, but a statesman of better judgment might have foreseen that, not a racial but a religious feud would probably be the result of the measure. What might have been expected followed. In Comilla, Jamalpur and a few other places, rather serious riots occurred. A few lives were lost, temples were desecrated, images broken, shops plundered, and many Hindu widows carried off. Some of the towns were deserted, the Hindu population took refuge in "pukka" houses (i e., house with brick or stone walls), women spent nights hidden in tanks, the crime known as "group-rape" increased, and throughout the country districts there reigned a general terror, which still prevailed at the time of my visit. Thus a new religious feud was established in Eastern Bengal, and when Mr. Morley said in the Commons that the disturbance was due to the refusal of Hindus to sell British goods to Mohammedans, it was a grotesque instance of the power that officials have of misleading their chief."[83] The special correspondent of the *Statesman* concurs in this view. He observes : "The Muslims may not have liked or approved of the boycott, but they did not appear to think that there was any reason to take upon themselves the task of suppressing *Swadeshi* ebullitions with physical force." He then significantly adds : "Some mysterious influence seems to have been at work here as elsewhere."

There is, however, no real mystery. It is painful to record, but difficult, if not impossible, to avoid the conclusion, that the British Government in India descended far below the average ideal and standard of a modern civilized Government in deliberately setting one community against another, with the full knowledge that it would lead to riots, bloodshed, plunder and raping, if not something worse, on a large scale; and all this in a country it was supposed to protect by holding the balance evenly between the different communities.

It was perhaps more in sorrow than in anger that C. J. O'Donnell, M. P., sorely aggrieved at the open partisanship of British officials towards the Muslims during the *Swadeshi* movement, put the question straight in the House of Commons : "May I ask since when has it become a part of the policy of the British people to sub-divide our possessions according to the religious tenets of their inhabitants ?"[84]

VIII. WIDER ASPECTS OF BOYCOTT AND SWADESHI MOVEMENT.

A. Boycott.

The twin ideas of *Swadeshi* and Boycott,—the first spontaneous fruits of the great upsurge of outraged popular feelings in 1905,—were largely complementary, as one could not succeed without the other. The boycott of foreign goods required that their place should be supplied by those produced in the country. The *Swadeshi* or promotion of indigenous industry could not succeed, when Indian industry was at its nascent stage, unless people deliberately eschewed foreign, and purchaged native, goods even at a pecuniary loss and sacrifice of comfort.

But though the two ideas were organically connected, there can be hardly any doubt that it was the idea of Boycott which first animated the people, and that of *Swadeshi* came later in its train. In view of the attitude of the Moderate party, it is necessary o emphasize the fact that it was Boycott which led to *Swadeshi*, and not vice versa. This is quite clear from the speeches and writings of the period. Reference may be made to the speech of Surendra Nath when he moved the resolution on the Partition of Bengal in the open session of the Congress at Varanasi (Banaras) in 1905. He not only admitted but stressed the fact that when the Bengalis found that all their protests, petitions and prayers were in vain and theirs was a voice crying in the wilderness, they were driven, in utter desperation, as a last resort, to the adoption of the Boycott. The Boycott was really a protest against the callous indifference of the British public in regard to Indian affairs and the contemptuous treatment of Indian public opinion by the Government of India.

The Bengalis were driven to the adoption of this policy of passive resistance which constituted a memorable departure from the usal political programme of the country. Surendra Nath Banerjee claimed that the protest went home. "It was", said he, "marvellously effective. What we could not achieve in 500 meetings, extending over two years' time, we secured by a boycott lasting for a period of three months. The Manchester Chamber of Commerce requested the leaders of Bengal to give up the boycott, but at the same time exerted all their influence upon the Secretary of State to cancel the partition of Bengal. I have the best reasons for believing, I said it to the Viceroy of India, I said so publicly, that a wire was sent by Mr. Brodrick to Lord Curzon on or about the 12th October asking him if possible to postpone the Partition till the meeting of the Parliament".[85] Lord Curzon declined and the Partition was carried out on the 16th October.

A section of the Moderate School of political thought was, however, definitely against the idea of boycott of foreign goods, though it welcomed the *Swadeshi*, to which it gave birth. In the first place, they ignored the historic origin of this Boycott. Even Gokhale felt sure that "most of those who spoke of the boycott mean by it only the use, as far as possible, of *Swadeshi*, articles in preference to foreign articles." Certainly the Bengalis, with whom the idea originated, could not subscribe to this view, for they looked upon Boycott as a sort of passive resistance, as Surendra Nath put it. Gokhale argued that 'boycott has a sinister meaning—it implies a vindictive desire to injure another.'[86] Gokhale therefore recommended that we would do well to use only the expression *Swadeshi* to describe our present movement, leaving alone the word 'boycott' which created unnecessary ill-will against ourselves. This typical Moderate attitude ignores the great historical fact that the Bengalis adopted the Boycott as a deliberate means to injure British interests. It would be highly improper to call it vindictive, because it was the only weapon left to the Bengalis to redress the great injury done by the British. Nor is it easy to understand why anyone should regard it as sinister. It was a weapon openly wielded to achieve a definite result, and other nations adopted it in similar circumstances, e.g., the Americans,

the Irish and the Chinese.[87] Gokhale backed up his view by the argument that as a strict boycott of foreign goods was not at all practicable in the then industrial condition, we would only make ourselves ridiculous by talking of a resolution which we could not enforce. But the succress of a movement is not to be judged by the test whether it achieved all that it urged ; the real test and masure of its success is the value of what it did achieve.

The agitation following the Partiton of Bengal brought into prominence the great value of passive resistance as a more effective weapon than the petition-making, hitherto the only method of political agitation known to the country and sanctified by the Indian National Congress.

This new doctrine was first expounded by B. C. Pal in September, 1906. It was, he explained, an organized effort to refuse to render any service to the Government by one and all, including employees of the Government.[87a] Brahmabandhab Upadhyaya, in his daily paper *Sandhya* of 21 November, 1906, held out the vision of a peaceful liberation of the country by adopting what was known in later days as non-co-operation on a massive scale. "If," said he, "the Government servants from the Chaukidar and Constable upwards to the Munsiff and Deputy Magistrate refuse to serve and resign in a body (if the Sepoys do the same, so much the better), the rule of the Firinghis will come to an end in a moment without firing a single shot."[87b]

The spirit indicated in these statesments was developed later into a full-fledged theory by Tilak and Arabinda Ghosh which will be described later. It may be said without much exaggeration that the doctrines of Non-co-operation and Civil Disobedience associated with the name of Mahatma Gandhi was fully anticipated by the Bengali leaders even during the early days of the agitation against the partition of Bengal.

This would have been a great achievement by itself, as subsequent events showed the great potency of Passive Resistance under the guidance of a leader like Mahatma Gandhi. But the Partition agitation did much more than this. It brought into activity the dormant political consciousness of the people at large, and gave a new and definite shape to the spirit of nationalism, which had been gathering strength for some time past, but had not yet assumed any clearly recognized form and emerg-

ed as a force to reckon with in Indian politics. A great national impulse suddenly brought into public what was hitherto hidden and latent, and gave cohesion and vitality to vague and scattered forces. The giant was asleep and nothing but a rude and violent shock could awaken him. The Partition gave that shock to Bengal and the whole political life of Bengal was revolutionised, almost overnight.

'There are moments in the life of an individual as well as of a nation when he is overwhelmed by an emotion and is guided by an instinct which leads him he knows not whither, the goal and direction being determined by his innate character. At such a moment reason halts, judgment is suspended,—only a great impulse moves the nation and carries everything before it. Bengal, in 1905-07, was passing through such a moment. It had no precedent and was strange to Indian politics. The Bengalis left the beaten track followed by the Congress, conceived new ideals, adopted new methods for their achievement, shed all fears, gave lie to their proverbial lack of physical courage, were ready for all sacrifice, braved all sufferings, and fearlessly faced death.' How was this transformation possible? The reply was given by a nationalist writer, J. L. Banerji: "The Partition made us conscious that we had a national life which was susceptible to wound and capable of expansion. Once consciousness had been awakened, the rest of the process was simple, nay it was inevitable; for with consciousness came strength; came desire to realise that new life to which we had awakened at last; desire led to action, and multiplied our new-born strength. Thus the seed which had been sown in darkness and matured in silence, burst all at once into the broad light of day and began to shoot and sprout and bourgeon with wondrous vigour and rapidity."[88]

B. Swadeshi

Although *Swadeshi* was originally conceived as merely a handmaid of 'Boycott' of foreign goods, and meant only to be an urge to use indigenous, in preference to foreign, goods, it soon attained a much more comprehensive character and became a concrete symbol of nationalism.

The gradual growth of this conception can be traced everywhere in India and among all schools of political thought. This may be illustrated by quoting the views expressed at the time by four eminent leaders. Surendra Nath Banerji traced the historic growth of this idea in a speech delivered in December, 1906. '*Swadeshism*', he said, "was, until its more recent developments, a purely economic movement which, in the particular circumstances of our province, received an impetus from political considerations.....I have heard the *Swadeshi* movement described as being in the domain of economics what the Congress is in the domain of politics. I venture to think it is a good deal more than that. It is not merely an economic or a political movement, but it is an all-comprehensive movement—co-extensive with the entire circle of our national life, one in which are centred the many-sided activities of our growing community.' Later Surendra Nath described it as the "shibboleth of our unity and industrial and political salvation." This he explains by saying that the *Swadeshi* would have a tremendous appeal to the masses who are indifferent to politics. It appeals to all ; it is understood by all. The Deccan peasant or the Bengali rustic may not understand the merits of a system of representative government or the subtle issues involved in the separation of executive and judicial service. But when they are told that it is to their advantage that the wealth of the country must be kept in the country, and in order to do so we should purchase country-made articles in preference to foreign articles, they open their eyes and ears wide and intuitively recognize that herein lies the solution of what to him is the problem of problems—the removal of poverty of themselves and their countrymen. Surendra Nath hoped that the *Swadeshi* would bring the masses and the classes together in our political agitation which would thereby acquire a formidable force.

In view of such potentialities Swadeshism was regarded by Surendra Nath as of Divine Origin and he claimed that "the Swadeshi leaders are humble instruments in the hands of Divine Providence walking under the illumination of His Holy spirit." He believed that men working under such a conviction and fortified by such a belief will dare all and do all.

Surendra Nath very rightly pointed out that that was the

spirit which animated Bengal, and *Swadeshism*, as an all-comprehensive movement, has revolutionised the ideals and conceptions of Bengalis. "The air," he said, "is surcharged with industrial spirit. The spirit of self-reliance is abroad. We are making an earnest and organised effort to place education, general and technical, under national control, and conduct it in accordance with national ideas and aspirations."[89]

But it was not the sentimental Bengalis alone who entertained this conception of *Swadeshi*. Gokhale, the prince of Moderates, and belonging to the race of cool-headed unemotional Marathas, observed in 1907 :

"I have said more than once, but I think the idea bears repetition, that *Swadeshism* at its highest is not merely an industrial movement but that it affects the whole life of the nation —that *Swadeshism* at its highest is a deep, passionate, fervent, all-embracing love of the motherland, and that this love seeks to show itself, not in one sphere of activity only, but in all ; it involves the whole man and it will not rest until it has raised the whole man. My own personal conviction is that in this movement we shall ultimately find the true salvation of India".[90]

Mahatma Gandhi, then unknown to name and fame, wrote in 1908 that "the real awakening (of India) took place after the Partition of Bengal," and also was shrewd enough to prophesy that "that day may be considered to be the day of the partition of the British Empire." He also realised the wider significance of the agitation for the repeal of the Partition. "The demand for the abrogation of the Partition is tantamount to a demand for Home Rule", said he..... "As time passes, the nation is being forged.....Hitherto we have considered that for redress of grievances we must approach the throne, and if we get no redress we must sit still, except that we may still petition. After the Partition, people saw that petitions must be backed up by force, and that they must be capable of suffering. This new spirit must be considered to be the chief result of the Partition". He explained the characteristics of the new spirit to be shedding of fear for the British or for imprisonment, and the inauguration of the *Swadeshi* movement. "That spirit", said he, "was seen in the outspoken writings in the press. That which the people said tremblingly and in secret began to be said

and to be written publicly. People, young and old, used to run away at the sight of an English face ; it now no longer awes them. They do not fear even a row, or being imprisoned. This is something different from mere petitioning." Gandhi further said : "The spirit generated in Bengal has spread in the north to the Punjab and in the south to Cape Comorin".[91]

Similar views were expressed in an article entitled "The Swadeshi Movement—A natural development" by G. Subrahmania Aiyar, the eminent leader of Madras. It may be summed up as follows :

'As the Congress is the revolt of the Indian people against their present political condition, so is the *Swadeshi* movement a revolt against their state of dependence in regard to their industrial condition, in fact, against it in all branches of their national life.'

"The *Swadeshi* movement, while directly striving for liberation from industrial dependence, recognises it only as a means to a great national end, to an all-comprehensive programme of reform and re-construction in the modern life of the people of India. Need we say that the *Swadeshi* movement has come to stay and grow from place to place and dimension to dimension ? Its full force and significance are evident in the wonderful progress it has made, not in Bengal alone, nor in any single province, but throughout the country, bringing into play unsuspected fresh energies and opening up fresh prospects of national expansion and prosperity. The tide is not of the same force or height everywhere ; but its sweep touches the extremities as well as the heart of the nation."

Referring to the passages from Surendra Nath's speech quoted above, he continues : "That these are words true and wise, will be known to anybody that has ever moved to advocate the *Swadeshi* cause. So far as Southern India is concerned, the most striking evidence of this fact is furnished by the success of the 'National Fund' movement.

"The National Fund movement is entirely divorced from all politics ; it is exclusively designed to help the industrial regeneration of India. The writer of this article has had opportunities to move with people in villages as well as in towns, and everywhere the importance and full scope of the movement were

undrstood with a readiness and infelligence hitherto unsuspected by our public men living in large centres of educated thought.

"The Congress has inspired the educated classes with the lofty sentiment of patriotism and of devotion to the elevation of their motherland ; but in the minds of the great masses it is the *Swadeshi* movement that is planting the seeds of National self-consciousness. It is teaching them to reflect on their present condition, on their common grievances, and on the common remedy of union and self-sacrifice. If the Congress was open to the charge of concerning itself with the aggrandisement of the educated classes—an unfounded and sinister charge, no doubt,—*Swadeshism* cannot possibly be charged with any such defect or weakness. The classes and the masses suffer equally from foreign ascendancy in our industrial as well as political status, and they can feel and act in unison and mutual sympathy. As Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjee said, if the Congress has brought the educated classes on the same platform, *Swadeshism* is bringing the classes and the masses together on the same platform. One chord of love for the motherland is not to be touched without causing response in all, so *Swadeshism*, though it appeals to the daily felt ever present material needs, appeals virtually to the sense of the people in regard to all aspects of their national existence.

"To create new industries, to place struggling ones on a firmer basis, to secure employment for labour, to increase population and wealth, to stimulate the productive powers of the nation, and to raise the country to a scale in civilisation worthy of its past history and its present resources,—such are the objects aimed at by the leaders of the *Swadeshi* movement in India. The *Swadeshi* movement is political as well as industrial in its spirit and scope. It is the child of the discontent of the modern Indians under their present condition of subjection and dependence."[92]

There can be hardly any doubt that the four great leaders from Bengal, Bombay, Gujarat and Madras have correctly represented the views permeating the educated classes of all shade of public opinion in India. The Nationalist school of thought received further inspiration from the Boycott Movement as explained by J. L. Banerji.[93] The same nationalist writer further

observes : "But to take the New Movement as synonymous with *Swadeshi* and Boycott or to explain it as originating in a series of unpopular Government measures will be to put an altogether narrow, straitened and limited interpretation upon it. The New Movement is something wider than *Swadeshi* and Boycott, nay, it is wider than Politics itself. It embraces the whole life and activity of a people. It is, if we may so take it, a necessary phase in the evolution of all States and Nationalities.[94]

The vernacular daily journal *Sandhya,* which appealed to masses in homely language, was never tired of repeating the view taken by the extreme nationalists. Day in and day out it went on proclaiming : "We want complete independence. The country cannot prosper so long as the veriest shred of the *Feringhi's* supremacy over it is left. *Swadeshi*, Boycott, all are meaningless to us, if they are not the means of retrieving our whole and complete independence.....Rights granted by the *Feringhis* as favour, we shall spit at and reject, and we shall work out our own salvation."[95] Even foreign writers were struck with the wider dimensions that the *Swadeshi* movement had gradually assumed. Valentine Chirol remarked : "The question of Partition itself receded into the background, and the issue, until then successfully veiled and now openly raised, was not whether Bengal should be one unpartitioned province or two partitioned provinces under British rule, but whether British rule itself was to endure in Bengal or, for the matter of that, anywhere in India."[96]

No less significant was the effect of the *Swadeshi* movement on Indian politics as a whole. In Bengal it brought into the vortex of politics the one class of people— the landed aristocracy —who had hitherto held studiously aloof from the Congress or any other political organization. Outside Bengal, it gave a rude shock of disillusionment to the whole of India and stimulated the political thoughts of the people. The different provinces were brought closer together in this hour of adversity which the rest of India shared with Bengal. The events in Bengal even shook the complacency of the great political leaders and made them, at least for the time being, waver in their long-cherished faith and belief in the clemency and justice of the British. This was

frankly expressed by Gokhale, the prince of Moderates, in his Presidential speech in the Congress Session at Banaras in 1905. "A cruel wrong", said he, "has been inflicted on our Bengalee brethren, and the whole country has been stirred to its deepest depths in sorrows and resentment, as had never been the case before. The scheme of Partition.....will always stand as a complete illustration of the worst features of the present system of bureaucratic rule—its utter contempt for public opinion, its arrogant pretensions to superior wisdom, its reckless disregard of the most cherished feelings of the people, the mockery of an appeal to its sense of justice, its cool preference of Service interests to those of the governed." Then, referring to the prominent persons who stood foremost among the opponents of the scheme of Partition, he made special mention of such men as Sir Jatindra Mohan Tagore, Sir Gooroodas Banerjee, Raja Peary Mohan Mukherjee, Dr. Rash Behari Ghosh, and the Maharajas of Mymensingh and Cossimbazar, "men who keep themselves aloof from ordinary political agitation and never say a word calculated in any way to embarrass the authorities and who come forward to oppose publicly the partition project only from an overpowering sense of the necessity of their doing what they could to avert a dreaded calamity. If the opinions of even such men are to be brushed aside with contempt, if all Indians are to be treated as no better than dumb, driven cattle ; if men, whom any other country would delight to honour, are to be thus made to realise the utter humiliation and helplessness of their position in their own, then all I can say is: 'Good-bye to all hope of co-operation in any way with the bureaucracy in the interest of the people!' I can conceive of no graver indictment of British rule than that such a state of things shall be possible after a hundred years of that rule." Events showed, however, that so far at least as the top leaders were concerned, the sentiment was no more real or permanent than the feeling of renunciation of world which overpowers a man in a cremation ground, when the body of a near and dear one was consigned to flames. Nevertheless, there is no denying the fact that Bengal's heroic fight made a deep impress upon Indian politics and changed its character. Gokhale acknowledged it in the following eloquent words :

"The tremendous upheaval of popular feeling which has taken place in Bengal in consequence of the Partition, will constitute a landmark in the history of our national progress. For the first time since British rule began, all sections of the Indian community, without distinction of caste or creed, have been moved by a common impulse and without the stimulus of external pressure, to act together in offering resistance to a common wrong. A wave of true national consciousness has swept over the Province and, at its touch, old barriers have, for the time at any rate, been thrown down, personal jealousies have vanished, other controversies have been hushed : Bengal's heroic stand against the oppression of a harsh and uncontrolled bureaucracy has astonished and gratified all India, and her sufferings have not been endured in vain, when they have helped to draw closer all parts of the country in sympathy and in aspiration. A great rush and uprising of the waters such as has been recently witnessed in Bengal cannot take place without a little inundation over the banks here and there. These little excesses are inevitable when large masses of men move spontaneously—especially when the movement is from darkness into light, from bondage towards freedom—and they must not be allowed to disconcert us too much. The most astounding fact of the situation is that the public life of this country has received an accession of strength of great importance, and for this all India owes a deep debt of gratitude to Bengal."

One particular aspect of the *Swadeshi* movement, which Mahatma Gandhi seems to have prized above everything else,[৯৫৯] should be specially emphasized. It taught the people to challenge and defy the authority of the Government openly, in public, and took away from the minds of even ordinary men the dread of police assault and prison together with the sense of ignominy which hitherto attached to them. To go to prison or get *lathi*-blows from the police became a badge of honour, and not, as hitherto, a brand of infamy. Brahmabandhab Upadhyaya, the editor of the popular Bengali Daily, *Sandhya*, explained the thing in a nice parable. A man suffering from elephantisis always used to threaten his son that he would kick him, and the latter had a mortal dread of a blow from such a

huge and massive leg. One day the father actually kicked his son, and the boy found to his surprise, that it was a quite soft mass of flesh and the dreaded pain was more imaginary than real. Similarly, the British Government always cowed down the people by holding out the dread of police and prison. But now that the people had tasted the horrors of both they found them not so terrible as they thought before.

Even still more important than the people's readiness to suffer was the public sympathy, openly displayed, for the sufferers in the cause of the country.

"The first meeting in honour of the political sufferers was held on February 14, 1906, in the teeth of strong opposition from the Anglo-Indians, the Europeans, and even some Indians. Mr. Allen, the Chairman of the Calcutta Municipality, at first gave permission to hold the meeting in the Town Hall, but later revoked his sanction. The venue of the meeting had to be changed to the Grand Theatre and Narendra Nath Sen took the chair.

Mr. Sen remarked in his Presidential address : "The occasion is a unique one, for this is the first time in the history of modern India that the nation has been called upon to honour people who have suffered for the country's cause. The event marks a new era in the history of our country, and heralds a new destiny for our countrymen. No nation need despair of its future that counts in its ranks men who are ready to suffer for their motherland." Surendra Nath Banerji also observed that "the Bengali of today is a very different personage from the Bengali as he is represented to be by historians," undaunted to-day by Governmental repression and undeterred from duty "by the frowns or smiles of power." The *Swadeshi* cause, he said, had been "consecrated by the sufferings of our young men." "We", he continued, "are impotent—our voice and our vote count for nothing in the counsels of the Empire..... If we cannot modify the punishments which have been inflicted, we can, at any rate, neutralize their effect upon public opinion. If the object of punishment be to deter by degrading, we say that those who have suffered in the *Swadeshi* cause shall not be degraded. If the object of punishment be to deter by the infliction of pain, we say that pain cheerfully borne is no

deterrent, and pain is cheerfully borne when the plaudits of the whole community and the mandate of an approving conscience follow the infliction."

"At the end of his speech Surendra Nath Banerji called out the names of the sufferers for the *Swadeshi* cause one by one, gave them '*Bande Mataram* Locket and Handkerchief' as tokens of honour and recognition, and greeted them with garlands. It was decided at the meeting that tokens of public honour would be sent to those sufferers who could not be present there that day." The meeting was attended by about 3,000 persons representing all classes and communities, and the President concluded the proceedings with the remark "that in honouring all these gentlemen who have suffered for the *Swadeshi* cause we are honouring ourselves as a nation."

The second meeting in honour of the sufferers was organized by the Muslims of Calcutta. It was held in the Albert Hall on February 16, and Maulavi Leakat Hossain took the chair. A third meeting was held at Bhawanipur, a suburb of Calcutta, on February 18, jointly by the Hindus and Muslims.[97]

C. The National Movement

The silent transformation of the *Swadeshi* movement into a great national movement, which merged itself into the successful struggle for freedom, constitutes the first great landmark in the history of India's fight for freedom in the first half of the 20th century. The slow but steady progress of this great movement will be described in the following pages. But before doing so it is necessary to trace the cause of this transformation.

The genesis of nationalism and its further development in the hands of a new class of leaders like Tilak, Arabinda, Lajpat Rai and B. C. Pal have been discussed above,[98] There can be hardly any doubt that the *Swadeshi* cum Boycott movement derived its inspiration and strength from this nationalism, the seeds of which were sown in the soil of Bengal in the sixties and seventies and which germinated under the fostering care of Bankim Chandra, Vivekananda and

others during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. This tender plant was now nursed with care by Arabinda, B. C. Pal, and Surendra Nath who found in the Boycott and *Swadeshi* movement a fruitful field of its practical application. Thus nationalism and *Swadeshi* movement acted and reacted upon each other, and each influenced and widened the scope of the other. It may be safely asserted that but for the newly awakened sense of nationalism the Boycott or *Swadeshi* could never have developed into a powerful movement. But it would, perhaps, be equally difficult to deny that it was the *Swadeshi* movement which brought nationalism from a realm of theory and sentiments into the field of practical politics which leavened the life of India as a whole. In revolutions men live fast, and move in ten years over a distance which they would have taken a century or more to cover in normal times. This miracle was achieved by the *Swadeshi* movement. India marched a longer distance towards its goal between 1906 and 1916 than it did between 1805 and 1905.

The chief traits of the new cult of nationalism have been delineated above. These were (i) the elevation of patriotism into a religion, and transformation of religion into patriotism by conceiving motherland not only as mother but as supreme God whose service is the only way to salvation ; (ii) belief in God as the leader of the movement, complete freedom as its goal, and Passive Resistance as its method. These were enunciated, with somthing like a spiritual fervour, by Arabinda Ghose, who came to Bengal as the high priest of new nationalism shortly after the inauguration of the *Swadeshi* movement. He joined the National Council of Education, mentioned above, but soon threw himself heart and soul into turning the Boycott and *Swadeshi* into a mighty national movement with the ideas indicated above. This he chiefly did through his writings in the *Bande Mataram* which, during its short tenure of life, gave a new meaning and new force to the *Swadeshi* movement. It is impossible, for example, to miss the real significance of his following utterances in the context of the Boycott and *Swadeshi* movement. "Politics is the ideal of Kshatriya, and the morality of the Kshatriya ought to govern our political actions. To impose in politics the Brahmanical duty of saintly

sufferance is to preach *Varnasankara*"—a remarkable contrast to the tenets of Mahatma Gandhi. Again, Arabinda preached :

"Love has a place in politics, but it is the love of one's country, for one's countrymen, for the glory, greatness, and happiness of the race, the divine *ananda* of self-immolation for one's fellows, the ecstasy of relieving their sufferings, the joy of seeing one's blood flow for country and freedom, the bliss of union in death with the fathers of the race. The feeling of almost physical delight in the touch of the mother-soil, of the winds that blow from Indian seas, of the rivers that stream from Indian hills, in the hearing of Indian speech, music, poetry, in the familiar sights, sounds, habits, dress, manners, of our Indian life,—this is the physical root of that love. The pride in our past, the pain of our present, the passion for the future are its trunk and branches, Self-sacrifice and self-forgetfulness, great service, high endurance for the country are its fruit. And the sap which keeps it alive is the realization of the Motherhood of God in the country, the vision of the Mother, the perpetual contemplation, adoration and service of the Mother." This is an elevation of politics to a spiritual fervour—a foretaste of his future career.

If Arabinda was the high priest, Rabindra Nath was the great poet of the *Swadeshi* movement. What Arabinda achieved in the realm of thought by his fearless writings, Rabindra Nath conveyed to the masses by his songs, incomparable in diction and inimitable in the melody of its tune. A few other poets also followed suit. It is impossible to convey even a faint idea of the force and beauty of these songs to one unacquainted with the Bengali language. But the English rendering of only *the beginnings* of a few of them, given in the next section, shows how they echoed the sentiments behind the new national spirit.

No less remarkable, though perhaps less effective as a mass propaganda, were some of the poems of Rabindra Nath, equally instinct with patriotism and national consciousness, and clothed in words of surpassing beauty. They are more varied in character. Some of these infused the landscapes of Bengal—its green meadows and paddy-fields, trees, plants and flowers, tanks, rivers and villages—with super-natural beauty so long latent to

ordinary eyes, and transmuted their physical features into a spiritual entity which transcended all narrow visions and merged them into the conception of a universal spirit. The idea which inspired Bankim Chandra to write the *Bande Mataram* hymn, was expressed through the mediums of charming poems and songs by Rabindra Nath. But Rabindra Nath did a great deal more. He sang the glories of ancient India and its culture and brought vividly before us the portraits of Shivaji and Guru Govinda as nation-builders, and of Banda as a symbol of the stoic heroism and spirit of sacrifice displayed by the Sikhs. Many of his ballads touch upon the patriotism, chivalry and heroism of the Rajputs, and the struggle of the Marathas and Sikhs for freedom. How profoundly they stirred the blood of the Bengali young men in the hectic days of the *Swadeshi* and prepared them for the great struggle that lay ahead—no words can adequately convey. But Arabinda and Rabindra Nath proved that 'pen is mightier than the sword'. For to them is lainly due the credit for the fact that the mighty British power failed to subdue the national spirit of the Bengalis. It is, however, only fair to mention that the work of both Rabindra Nath and Arabinda was ably supplemented by a number of other poets and writers.

There were great personalities like Surendra Nath Banerji and Aswini Kumar Datta whose precepts and examples sustained the *Swadeshi* movement in its active form, and a host of other eminent leaders who ably helped them in their work. But without detracting in any way to their merit and denying the honour justly due to them, one cannot ignore the fact that the writers and nationalists like Rabindra Nath and Arabinda, and their followers, are entitled to the chief credit for changing the *Swadeshi* into a genuine national movement which swept the whole country. The role played by the nationalists will be dealt with in the next section. That of literature will be briefly noted here.

D. Nationalist Literature

The *Swadeshi* movement ushered in a new era in Bengali literature. The inimitable poems and songs composed by poet Rabindra Nath breathed altogether a new spirit and Bengal was

carried off her feet. As will be noted later, these songs and poems also inspired the revolutionaries of Bengal.

Less poetic, but not less appealing in the particular situation of the time, were other songs composed by a host of writers. One of these opened with the following lines : "Place on your head, with reverence, the coarse cloth that your mother gives you ; for poor as she is, the cannot afford to give anything better." This song was widely sung all over Bengal by way of appeal to the people to buy only indigenous clothes. The author, Rajani Kanta Sen, was a very popular poet and composed many other songs which made deep appeal to the masses. There were many other poems, songs and miscellaneous writings in prose which were marked by intense hatred of the British and passionate feeling of love for the motherland. A few specimens of these patriotic songs are given below, in English translation (of the opening lines only).[99]

1. "When, O Mother, did you appear
   Out of Bengal's heart
   In your peerless beauty!"
2. "O my country's dust, on you I rest my head ;
   On you has she, the Mother of all,
   The Universe's Mother,
   Spread wide her skirt."
3. "Blessed is my birth, my birth in this land ;
   In loving you, O Mother, I've found
   The best fulfilment of my birth."
4. "Come, O Goddess Fierce, come,
   Punish the devilish men of violent strength
   Who dare, in this new age, break limbs to pieces."
5. "Fallen India needs you, O killer of demon Mura (Krishna),
   Come, with your discuss *Sudarsana*,
   And teach her men and women,
   Initiate them,
   In knowledge new and novel paths of life."

Novels, dramas and poems were written invoking the memory and achievements of great Indian heroes and fighters

for freedom, like Shivaji, Rana Pratap Simha, the Rajput Chief Durgadas, and even the ancient hero Chandra Gupta Maurya. A drama by D. L. Roy, entitled, the *Fall of Mewar*, gave an opportunity to the author to give vent to the anti-British feelings under the disguise of speeches, actions and songs against the Mughal rulers, the eternal enemy of Mewar. Lest there be any mistake about the real intention of the author, the Mughal rulers were referred to as Mughal tigers, a thinly veiled disguise for British lions, which no one failed to understand.

The drama based on the life of Shivaji also gave equal opportunity to inflame the hatred against the British and strengthen the resistance against their oppression, by putting appropriate speeches in the mouth of Shivaji against Aurangzeb, and depicting actions relating to the Mughal-Maratha war. A popular form of drama, known in Bengal as *Yatra*, was also utilised to stimulate the national and patriotic feelings. This could be easily performed in villages as it required no stage or scenes, and therefore became a powerful medium of appeal to the masses. One Mukunda Das obtained great fame and popularity by introducing a novel type of *Yatra*, in which the plot was devised in such a way as to invoke the patriotic sentiment of the people and excite their animosity against the British. Indeed the propaganda was so apparent and effective, that Mukunda's *Yatra* was proscribed and he was sent to jail for seditious activities. But Mukunda had followers, though of less reputation. The Bengali dramatists did not always rely on genuine history. The history of Bengal, as known at the time, could not supply the heroes suiting the spirit of the time. So fiction took the place of history. Pratapaditya, a petty chief in Bengal early in the 17th century, and some of his compeers formed the centre of heroic legends of brave fights against the Mughals, and though the story had to be placed during the Muslim period, it was utilized in inciting resistance against the British, without making oneself liable to charge of sedition. As a matter of fact, patriotic outbursts of the Hindu Chiefs against the Muslim rulers were meant to be really declamations by modern Bengal against the British, and it was understood in that spirit.

A typical example is furnished by the Drama 'Pratapaditya.' He was represented as fishting till the last against Mughals for his country, and his patriotic utterances were only a pale reflex of the speeches in public meetings during the *Swadeshi* days.

Thus the *Swadeshi* movement created a type of literature which was frankly propagandist. Another characteristic of this literature was to interpret history with a deliberate view to use it to support the current political movements and slogans. The most important among these in the *Swadeshi* days was the cry of brotherhood or fraternity between Muslims and Hindus, and the assumption of strong national feelings on the part of the Muslims. By way of stimulating these ideas Akshayakumar Maitra wrote two historical works to prove that Siraj-ud-daulah and Mir Kasim were both great patriots and nationalists, prepared to sacrifice everything for the sake of freeing their country from the domination of the British. Siraj-ud-daulah, whom the British painted in the blackest colour, was represented in a very favourable light, as a great nationalist and hero fighting for Bengal's freedom against the English. A drama called *'Siraj-ud-daulah'* was written by Giris Chandra Ghosh in which patriotic speeches were delivered by Siraj-ud-daulah on the model of the orations during the *Swadeshi* movement, and the general trend of the whole drama was to present a picture of the united front of Hindus and Muslims fighting for national cause against the British. It is needless to add that such books have no claim to be treated as history, and in some cases, particularly the drama, were a deliberate perversion of history. But they served their purpose well. Sometimes even whole history was perverted in order to support the prevailing political conceptions. As an instance may be cited the elaborate attempt made by even eminent men to misrepresent the relation between Hindus and Muslims, during the medieval period of Indian history, as much more favourable and friendly than it actually was.

In a similar spirit the outbreak of 1857 was represented as a great national struggle for independence. Its heroes and heroines were lauded to the skies in order to infuse a militant national spirit into the fighters for freedom among the Indian

nationalists of the 20th century. It is very significant to note that whereas the contemporary Bengali, and for the matter of that, Indian writers, almost without any exception, denounced the "Sepoy mutiny",[99a] the *Swadeshi* movement lifted it to the level of a War of Independence. It is needless to give other examples, but on the whole, so far at least as the Bengali literature is concerned, it was both used and abused in order to sustain the spirit of newly gained national consciousness and fervent patriotism that the *Swadeshi* movement had brought forth. Nevertheless, it is hardly possible to exaggerate the importance of the role it played in the new era that this movement had ushered in. For, whatever we may think of the real character of the literary productions of the age from historical point of view, they were taken as genuine, and produced immense effect. The songs, poems, novels, dramas, historical works, esays, and other types of writings generated genuine national feelings such as were never experienced before.

In this way the whole atmosphere of Bengal was surcharged with a new literary current, which galvanized the whole country. It gave a new meaning to *Swadeshi* and a formidable strength to the newly awakened national consciousness of the people. Indeed it may be said without much exaggeration that such a powerful impact of a great popular movement on contemporary literature,—and vice versa,—is unprecedented in the annals of India, and nothing like this was seen even when the Civil Disobedience movement, initiated by Mahatma Gandhi, was at its highest point. Much of this literature has become a permanent asset and will ever remain a standing witness to the new spirit that convulsed Bengal from one end to the other.

History gives numerous examples where a genuine national reawakening is symbolized in art and literature, which in their turn sustain and speed up the national movement, so that each reacts upon the other. The Bengali literature of the *Swadeshi* days illustrates this truth. It was a product of the *Swadeshi* movement, but also helped to promote that movement to a not inconsiderable degree.

It would be wrong to suppose that the literary ebullition in Bengal was the product of cheap sentimentalism and had no touch with real life. It is on record that after the severe *lathi*

charge on the occasion of the Barisal Conference, mentioned above;[100] hundreds of young men appeared in the Pandal—many of them with bandages or bleeding wounds—singing: "I do not fear death, if I may die, Oh mother, in thy service, with *Bande-Mataram* on my lips." Batches of handcuffed picketers, while being led, after severe beating, to the police lock-up, sang in chorus: "Am I such an unworthy son of my mother as to forget her on being struck with *lathis* (canes) or for fear of gallows? Bloodshed will enhance our strength and endurance. Who will fly for life, leaving mother in the lurch?" If the nationalist spirit created the songs, they on their part sustained it in real life.

The patriotic fervour animating Bengali literature found other means of expression. One of the most important was the Shivaji festival. Its origin in Maharashtra, in 1895, under the inspiration of Tilak, has been described above.[101] As Tilak himself said, it "was started in Maharashtra with the hope that it will spread all over India." Bengal took up the idea and the festival was celebrated in Calcutta in 1902. Subsequently the festival was held every year in Calcutta and some *moffussil* towns like Barisal. In 1904, under the shadow of the impending disaster of the Partition, and the consequent rise of national feeling into a high pitch, an unusual interest gathered round the festival. It was on the occasion of the festival, held in 1904 in Calcutta, that Rabindra Nath wrote his soul-stirring poem, *Shivaji*, which will last as long as the Bengali language endures. The festival was also celebrated at Barisal in September, 1904, with great enthusiasm. "At the end of the meeting pamphlets and photographs of Shivaji were distributed free among the audience. Aswini Kumar observed in his speech that hardly he had seen in Barisal such a vast assemblage of men as on this occasion, and pointed out that the pulse of a new life was beating fast in the nation."[102] But the celebration of the festival at Calcutta in 1906 was unprecedented in character. The programme of the festival, which lasted for four days (4-8 June), included an exhibition of *Swadeshi* goods. It was attended by all-India nationalist leaders like Tilak, Khaparde, Lajpat Rai and Munje. Tilak justly described it as a "political festival," and the whole thing was undoubtedly designed as an

incentive to the nationalist movement into which the *Swadeshi* movement was gradually merging.

The most significant feature of the festival was the largely attended public meeting held on 5th June with Aswini Kumar Datta in the chair. The whole meeting was a seething mass of human heads, and hundreds, possibly even thousands, had to go away disappointed for want of even standing space. The President, in his speech, observed :

"If the Hindus had a national hero of their own in modern times it was emphatically the founder of the Maratha dynasty. .....The object of the Shivaji festival is to awaken in us a feeling of respect for the noble, the disinterested, and the self-sacrificing life of Shivaji. The other object of the festival is the union of the Bengalees with the Marathas."

Tilak also addressed the meeting. "Human nature," he said, "is so constituted that we cannot do without festivals. It is the nature of man to love festivals. If you want to keep up your spirit you should assemble once a year at least and you should concentrate your intellectual and spiritual forces upon a particular idea. The *utsabs* were originated and celebrated simply to keep the memories of days gone by." The nationalist leaders, who attended the meeting, were hard put to it to reconcile the Muslims—some of whom attended the meeting—to the festival of one whom they justly regarded as the greatest enemy of the Muslim empire of the Mughals. They wriggled out of it by a wholesale perversion of Indian history which can be excused only on grounds of political expediency. How false history was preached by even eminent Hindu leaders in order to secure the Muslim co-operation in their struggle against the British was well illustrated in the meeting. Thus Aswini Kumar Datta, who probably never deviated an inch from truth in his private life, is reported to have said :

"The bitterrness of racial feeling between the Hindus and Musalmans had almost died out at the time....It did not, therefore, matter in the least, either to the Hindus or to the Musalmans, whether a Musalman or a Hindu sovereign held the supreme power in India when Shivaji flourished."

It is only necessary to remember that Shivaji flourished in

the time of the most bigoted emperor Aurangzib who demolished many Hindu temples including those at Banaras and Mathura, and dismissed wholesale all his Hindu clerks in obedience to the Quran. Further, that it was the reimposition of the hated tax *Jizya* on the Hindus that inflamed the Rajputs against Aurangzib, and Shivaji has ever been honoured by the Marathas as the founder of the *Hindu Pad Padshahi*. But in view of the acute Hindu-Muslim differences over the Partition it was necessary, at all costs, to prevent alienation of Muslim sympathy by causing exacerbation of feelings over the festival in honour of Shivaji. Like the Chairman, Tilak, who was also inspired by the same motive, gave an entirely false interpretation of history. "Shivaji", he said, "did not fight against the Mahomedan but against the tyrannical power that existed at that time. That is the true spirit in which you must read the life of Shivaji, and if you read the life of Shivaji in the proper spirit I can assure you that you are sure to derive an inspiration, a sentiment in life which will serve you in these days." How far it 'served' the cause which Tilak had in view will be shown in the subsequent chapters of this volume. But it is difficult to believe that Tilak could forget, either the cry of *Hindu-Pad-Padshahi* which rallied the Marathas under the banner of Shivaji, or that the Peshwas—Chitpavan Brahmins, to which class Tilak himself belonged—fought for establishing Maratha supremacy in place of the Mughal empire and were not inspired by the abstract ideal of fighting tyranny.

But all these historical anomalies and absurdities merely emphasise the nationalist currents underlying the Shivaji festival like the dramatic works on Siraj-ud-daula mentioned above. The Shivaji festival of 1906 in Calcutta ended in a drama in actual life. Jogesh Chaudhuri, who was asked to read the President's speech, was so much moved by its spirit that after finishing it, he added the following on his own account :

"Before stepping down I must say one word. We must tell you that now we are one nation, although we are going to admire every Mahomedan hero and Hindu hero. No one in this audience thinks now that we are two nations, We are now one nation—Hindus and Mahomedans—and we must embrace each other as brothers.[103] It was an admirable idea to rope in

the Muhammadans even in the Shivaji festival. But it proved to be a rope of sand.

In conclusion reference may be made to a remarkable pronouncement on the part that the *Swadeshi* movement of Bengal played in transforming the nationalism of India and making it richer and more comprehensive. Mr. J. Ramsay Masdonald, who later became the Prime Minister of Britain, wrote in the *Daily Chronicle* :

"The Bengalee inspires the Indian Nationalist movement. In Bombay the Nationalist is a Liberal politician, a reformer who takes what he can get and makes the best use of it. In the Punjab he is a dour, unimaginative person who shows a tendency to work in a lonely furrow. In Bengal he is a person of lively imagination who thinks of India, and whose nationalism finds expression not only in politics, but in every form of intellectual activity. Indeed I have not taken away with me a very favourable impression of Bengal politics. There are no good political leaders there. They have excellent speakers and eloquent writers, but none of their prominent men seem to have that heaven-given capacity to lead. They are magnificent agitators (I use the word in no uncomplimentary sense). They can prepare men to be led, but no shephered there steps forward to pipe the flocks to the green pasture.

"But Bengal is perhaps doing better than political agitation. It is idealising India. It is translating nationalism into religion, into music and poetry, into painting and literature.

"From Bengal gush innumerable freshets of religion all flowing to revive and invigorate the Nationalist spirit. A literary revival makes for the same end. It is still crude, particularly in its romance, but it is groping after Hindu realism. It is written in Bengalee in the same aggressive way that some of our Irish friends are trying to revive the use of Erse. So also in music, poetry and the fine arts. That last, glowing with nationalist spirit, has been revived by (Abanindra Nath) Tagore and some of his pupils. The former enjoys already a vigorous popular life. They brought us out on the river on Sunday, and sang to us *"Bande Mataram"* amongst other things. Their *"Marseillaise"* and their *"Carmagnole"* are hymns thanking God for endowing life with beauty, are invocations to India,

their mother, full of yearning endearments. They sang from well-thumbed copies of a collection of hymns written by (Rabindra Nath) Tagore, the poet, and the music, much of it new, and all so unlike our own, clung round our hearts and stole again and again all that day into our ears.

"That is what Bengal is doing for the National movement. It is creating India by song and worship, it is clothing her in queenly garments. Its politics must be for some time an uncertain mingling of extremist impossibilism and moderate opportunism. It is romantic, whilst the Punjab is dogmatic.....Bengal will brood for long over the bereavement to its heart caused by the Partition, it will cling fondly to Swadeshi, on the shores of its enthusiasm it will throw up the bomb-thrower as a troubled sea throws up foam ; and from this surging of prayer and song and political strife will come India—if India ever does come.

"Later on, I sat at the table of the Great Official, and, in bad temper and rude manner, he demanded of me to tell him where I had been and whom I had seen and so what I was thinking. I told him of the hymns and the pictures and the prayers. And he laughed a great rude Western laugh and explained things by reasons made up of blind Western superficialities. He knew nothing about the picture ; the hymns were a mixture of double meaning and sedition to him. Each sentence ended with the authoritative 'I know'.

"Do the Great Officials really know? Is it the case with them, then, that though knowledge has come, "wisdom lingers"?[104]

IX. SPLIT BETWEEN THE MODERATES AND EXTREMISTS

The agitation following the partition of Bengal brought into prominence the rise of a new political party which differed in essential points from that which had hitherto dominated the Indian National Congress. This new party is really the product of the new spirit of nationalism to which reference has been made above in Book II, Chapter V. The doctrines which it advocated were being promulgated some time, if not very long, before the Partition of Bengal. But hitherto it did not make

any headway or create any stir in the public life of India. The spirit of opposition which was evinced by the Bengalis since 1904 with regard to the Partition of their country gave a fillip to the new political party, and since then it became a great rival to the old and, ultimately, supplanted it. These two parties were known, respectively, as Moderates and the Extremists, and it is better to retain the use of these terms to indicate the two main political parties, representing two distinct schools of thought, though, for reasons as will appear later, these terms are neither very happy nor very accurate.

The transformation of a Moderate into an Extremist, due to the agitation against Partition, is best illustrated by the example of Bipin Chandra Pal. He did not share the nationalist or anti-Congress views of Arąbinda Ghose and B. G. Tilak expressed during the last decade of the nineteenth century.[104a] Even in 1902 he echoed the views of the old Congress leaders. On the occasion of the Shivaji festival in Calcutta in 1902, he delivered a speech expatiating on the Indian loyalty to the British empire. "We are loyal," said he, "because we believe that God himself has led the British to this country, to help it in working out its salvation.....And as long as Britain remains at heart true and faithful to her sacred trust, her statesmen and politicians need fear no harm from the upheaval of national life in India.....Not is the realisation of our highest national destiny, necessarily in any way inconsistent with the realisation of the highest ideals of the Empire of which we form so large and vital a part."[104b] Somewhat later, on August 7, 1902, he wrote in his paper, *New India*: "Our loyalty—in the sense of allegiance to law and constituted authority—is so natural, unconscious, so automatic indeed, that no effort is needed on the part of the Government to train us in this virtue.....The Indians accept the 'existence of the British Government,' as Sir Henry Cotton truly says, 'as an irrevocable necessity which has done immense service to them."[104] But all this was changed by the callous attitude of the Government towards the agitation against Partition of Bengal in 1904. On December 21, 1904, he wrote in the *New India*: "The belief that England will of her own free will help Indians out of their long-established civil servitude and establish those free institu-

tions of Government which he herself values so much was once cherished, but all hope has now been abandoned. What India really wants is a reform in the existing constitution of the State, so that the Indians will govern themselves as other nations do, follow the bent of their own national genius, work out their own political destiny, and take up their own legitimate place, as an ancient and civilised people, among the nations of the world.''[104d] Henceforth Pal fell in line with the nationalist leader, Arabinda Ghose, and became a pillar of the Nationalist School and the Extremist Party, as has been stated above.[104e] Referring to the emergence of these, Pal observed in 1907, that "it was Curzon and his Partition plan, involving as they did a total disregard of the popular will, that had destroyed our old illusion about British India.''[104f]

The political changes and transformations through which Bipin Chandra Pal himself passed were typical of what was taking place all over India, and brought into sharp relief the two political parties labelled as Moderates and Extremists. For reasons which will be discussed in detail in the next chapter, these two parties were gradually drifting apart owing to new developments in *Swadeshi* movement. In particular, the Moderates could not reconcile themselves with the boycott of foreign goods and the existing educational institutions. It is singular that even the Moderates of Bengal did not throw their whole weight in favour of the Boycott resolution in the Banaras Session of the Congress (1905).[105] The Extremist Party in Bengal, therefore, looked for outside leaders to help and guide it. The first fruit of this new alignment was seen in the Shivaji Festival of 1906, described above.[106] It is noteworthy that while Tilak, Lajpat Rai and Khaparde were specially invited and took prominent part in the festival, the Moderate leaders, even of Bengal, including Surendra Nath figured nowhere. Aswini Kumar Datta of Barisal was the only Moderate leader of old who still kept his position, as he extended his sympathy and support to the Extremists.

As the *Swadeshi* movement outstripped its original limitation and became an all-India Movement, so the Extremist Party of Bengal became an all-India Party under the leadership of Tilak, Lajpat Rai, Khaparde, B. C. Pal and Arabinda Ghose. This was an accomplished fact before the end of 1906, and the

new alignment in Indian politics was the most striking feature in the Congress Session held in Calcutta in December of that year.

The difference between the Moderates and the Extremists was accentuated by the return of the Liberal Party to power in England at the close of 1905. The autocratic regime of Lord Curzon, which set public opinion at naught, was a great blow to the Moderate Party's cherished ideals and seemed to blast the hope of the people in general of receiving any justice from the British. The liberal traditions of the new British Government, and specially the appointment of John Morley as Secretary of State for India, revived the hope that the Indians might still achieve a great deal by following the old policy of petition and agitation. On the other hand, the emergence of the Extremist Party alarmed the British and made them turn towards the Moderates as the only friend of the British Government. Hence, unconsciouusly, grew the British policy of rallying the Moderates. The Moderates were coaxed into the belief that the Liberal Government would grant a substantial instalment of reforms. But it soon appeared that the condition precedent to it was that the Moderates must dissociate themselves from the Extremists. The Moderates did not realize that they were now valued only because of the British apprehension of the Extremists, and they fell into the trap. All this was at the time a matter of speculation, but the publication of Morley's *Recollections*, and the *Memoir* of the Countess of Minto make the whole thing crystal clear. It is now possible to understand the significance of many actions of the Moderate Party in the light of these revelations.

It is quite clear that both Minto and Morley wanted to win over the Moderates with the help of Gokhale, who figures prominently in the correspondence between the two. They really had no great love for, or faith in, Gokhale, but sought merely to utilize his service so long as it suited their purpose. Here is an extract from Lady Minto's *Memoir* : "Minto truly was no sooner in the saddle than he was called upon to deal with a difficult situation .....Their Royal Highnesses' visit was to be boycotted. A crisis seemed imminent. 'Send for Gokhale, I must see him', said the Viceroy.....As Gokhale left the Viceroy's room, he turned to Colonel Dunlop Smith (the Private Secretary) and said: "His Excellency shows sympathy and understanding. I will stop

the boycott".[167] Gokhale was true to his word. How, during the Congress Session of 1905, he induced the Extremists not to vote against the resolution welcoming their Royal Highnesses will be told in the next Chapter.

Probably neither Gokhale nor the other Moderates knew that Minto and Morley did not look upon them as good friends, but merely used them as tools to serve their purpose. When the Moderates failed to deliver the goods, Minto's wrath knew no bounds; Gokhale ceased to be a good boy and became a stupid one. On 7 August, 1907, Minto wrote to Morley: "As to Gokhale, if he chooses to play with fire he must take the consequences..... I am thoroughly disappointed in Gokhale. I had liked what I had seen of him and believed be was honest at heart, but the part he has played of late has disgusted me. As an honest moderate he has lost a great opportunity of discountenancing rank sedition....."[168] When Gokhale had the temerity to criticise the proposed reforms, Minto thundered forth: "I never for an instant thought that our reforms would be welcomed by the extremists, but I hardly expected Gokhale would play such a stupid game as he is doing. It is such trash his talking about the bureaucracy putting down the Congress and brushing him and his friends aside. He could have played a great game if, while asserting his own political honesty, he had recognized our good intentions and done his best to assist the Government of India. I spoke very openly to him on these lines, but he has evidently no intention of coming to our support, and what he has now written entirely gives him away."[169]

But neither Gokhale nor the Moderates chose to become bond-slaves of the Government. When the Moderates were not quite satisfied with the Reforms of 1909, Gokhale wrote to a friend in England about it. Morley sent to Minto an extract from this letter, with the remark that it "shows he is not always reliable". Here is Minto's reply to Morley, dated October 19. 1910.

"I am glad you sent me the extract from Gokhale's letter to his friend in England. It is very important as showing his hand, I am sorry to say. I can only call it mischievous, and written with the intention to mislead. Gokhale would not have spoken in the same sense to me. And that is the worst of him,

that one cannot rely upon his absolute good faith. I know him well, admire him much, and am on most friendly terms with him. In ability and breadth of view he is a long way ahead of any Indian in political life. But he must know quite well that the picture he gave in his letter is not a true one. Our repressive measures are certainly not severe, and the suggestion that they will be hardly used is unjustifiable. The tendency of Local Governments will be generally the other way.....Then the suggestion that the official world is opposed to reform and advance is quite untrue. There has been extraordinary change in that direction. No doubt the Reforms were originally unpopular generally with the bureaucracy, but the people who do not recognize their value now are very few and far between.... But the worst symptom in what Gokhale writes is that he apparently does not mean to accept the Reforms with the goodwill which is so important for their success. I had a hint the other day that this was the line he unfortunately meant to adopt. I had hoped he was a big enough man to accept them as the machinery the Government of India now has to work with, and that he would devote himself to public affairs in accordance with the machinery, but if he goes on the lines of at once picking holes in it and asking for further alterations, he will make a great mistake in a patriotic sense." But the sting was in the tail. Minto continued : "After all, Gokhale represents a very small minority in India, but it is a dangerous minority in that undue weight is attached to its views. It is most important that Gokhale should speak, write and act sensibly, and I don't at all like the tone of the extract. If I get a chance of speaking to him in the above sense I shall do so."[110] So when Gokhale ventured to differ from the official view, he only represented a very small minority. The Moderates assumed importance only when they "*speak, write* and *act* sensibly," as Minto understood the terms.

X. THE SPIRIT OF MILITANT NATIONALISM.

One of the most important phases of the *Swadeshi* movement was to endow the militant nationalism with a new and lofty spirit.

As has been mentioned above,[117] the ideas of setting up secret revolutionary societies were in the air from the seventies or eighties of the 19th century ; but, excepting the single instance of Phadke in Bombay, they did not take any definite shape or form till the close of the century. Their activities during the first few years of the 20th century were not very notable, and it was not till the great upheaval in Bengal caused by the partition of the province, that they took deep root in the soil and developed a well-knit organization which gradually spread all over India. Nevertheless, the early history of these secret societies establishes two important facts which have never been very clearly recognized.

In the first place, the so-called terrorist activities were neither sudden and isolated reactions against any specific measures of the Government, nor designed as a remedy against any particular grievance. The overt acts of secret societies were the outward manifestations of a determined and violent resistance to the British with a deliberate view to overthrowing their rule in India. Underground societies existed before the plague-incidents in Bombay and the Partition of Bengal. No doubt their activities were stimulated by these specific incidents, and gathered momentum from them, but they do not owe their origin to any such incident. The real genesis of these secret societies is to be traced back to the growth of new nationalism described above, and is merely a further development of the same spirit in an extreme form. Save in methods of operation it is hard to distinguish the terroists from the true nationalists of the new school. The essential and fundamental ideas are the same in the two cases ; but while the nationalists relied mainly on passive resistance or other forms of self-assertion on an organized basis, the extreme left school had no faith in these methods and activities, and regarded armed resistance as the only feasible way of destroying British power. As the immediate or open organization of such resistance was not practicable, they had to prepare the ground by secret societies. For these reasons, this new cult of violence, forming the left wing of the new nationalism, may be termed militant nationalism. The terms, 'terrorism,' 'anarchism,' etc., used by the British Government, do not really convey the spirit of the new

movement, and were repudiated by the members themselves, as unjust, unfair, and inaccurate. For, as they rightly pointed out, the members of the underground movement in Bengal were not anarchists or nihilists whose only aim was to create chaos or confusion. Howsoever their methods might differ, they were all inspired by the common aim of driving away the British from India and establishing *Swaraj*, i.e. the Government of the people, by the people, for the people.

In one sense this militant nationalism may be regarded as a continuation of that spirit of open resistance against the British which we have traced throughout the nineteenth century. But there is a vital difference. The motive power behind the acts of resistance against the British throughout the nineteenth century was disaffection and discontent, due to a variety of causes,—personal, political, social, economic, and religious. They were not prompted by a sense of patriotism and sustained by the true spirit of nationalism—for the very simple reason that neither of these two great forces as yet took hold of the public mind. They were the creations of western education and did not fully develop on Indian soil till the close of the nineteenth century. This explains why militant nationalism was confined to the educated Indians who took hardly any part in the revolt of the nineteenth century and had little sympathy even with the great outbreak of 1857.

This brings us to the second characteristic of this militant nationalism which has not yet received sufficient recognition. There is no doubt that it had a definite and deliberate aim to overthrow the British Government, and as such falls under the legal category of sedition. The view generally held at the time, and given expression to by eminent political leaders, vehemently denied this. It is true that their statements should not be taken at their face value as they were possibly dictated more by political considerations than a regard for historical truth. Nevertheless, even making due allowance for the exigencies of the time, it seems to be quite clear that the political leaders of the time, specially those of the Moderate school, had never understood the true significance of the movement, far less appreciated the spirit lying behind it. Thus one of them, a leading Bengali, wrote as follows even so late as 1915.

"The cry of Sedition was as false as it was senseless and impolitic. There never was in these years a movement anywhere to subvert British rule in India, nor was there a single overt act lending colour to a possible tendency towards such a movement, besides some insane, meaningless, incoherent inflammatory effusions contained in a few anonymous pamphlets or leaflets which some mischievous urchins might circulate for creating either a fun or a senseless sensation in the country.....

"It seems difficult to conceive how the secret manufacture of some bombs in a private garden, the assassination of a few police officers, the secret murder of Magistrate, or even the daring attempt on the life of an innocent Lieutenant Governor at a public place, however atrocious these acts may be, can be regarded as any evidence of sedition or treason, or how any people outside an asylum could ever dream of driving away the British from India with the help of some bundles of bamboo sticks, a few ounces of picric acid, a few packets of gunpowder, or even of a few dozens of old, rusty smuggled revolvers. The idea is simply quixotic. To whatever lengths human ingenuity may go to strain and stretch the definition of sedition or high treason, common sense must always refuse to believe that a handful of misguided young men, with no other instruments than these in their possession could really have thought of 'waging war against the King.' However seriously the situation may have been taken by a bureaucracy placed in a distant foreign land, even the most ardent loyalist in the country regarded the panic as quite mistaken and exaggerated beyond all proportion."[112]

Such a view errs in the opposite direction, almost as much as the official designation "terrorism", "anarchism" etc. Whatever their number, or method of operation, the members of the extreme school of militant nationalism were revolutionaries, pure and simple. They wanted to free the country from the British yoke by armed resistance, open or secret, or both combined, and their ultimate aim was to bring about an armed rebellion against the constituted authority. It is curious to note that the Sedition Committee of 1918 used the term 'revolutionary' in their Report, even while describing the

crimes like political dacoities and murders of officials. This is really the just and proper designation of the members of what we have called the left wing of militant nationalism. Henceforth we shall also refer to the so-called "terrorists" and "anarchists" as revolutionaries, and apply the term militant nationalism to the movement of which they were the products.

Since militant nationalism, as an organized movement, had its origin in Bengal, it is necessary to trace in detail the different stages of its growth and the forces underlying its development. As noted above, the secret societies in Bengal, at the beginning, had concentrated their attention upon drill, gymnastics, riding, boxing, *lathi*-play and similar exercises. But gradually they took to terrorist activities with firearms and bombs, due mainly to the influence exercised by the examples of Italy, Russia and Ireland. One important consideration specially appealed to the youths of Bengal. There was a general feeling among the Indians that the Bengalis were an inoffensive and peaceful people unused to, and incapable of, physical exertion, so much so that they were often branded as cowards. The youth of Bengal was determined to remove this stigma by acts of daring and heroic sacrifice. Dr. Bhupendra Nath Datta tells us that some time in 1903 or 1904 he heard from Arabinda Ghose that some *sadhus* (hermits) on the banks of the Narmada learnt by *Yoga* practices that there will be a great all-India revolutionary movement in 1906, which is being organized from Maharashtra as its centre, but the coward Bengalis are keeping aloof from it, and so endeavour must be made to induce them to join it. Young Bengal could not take this insult lying down and decided to organize a revolutionary army. The cowardice of the Bengalis had appeared in bold relief when they calmly suffered terrible oppression to be perpetrated by the Government on them in 1905-6. Tilak asked Debabrata Basu at Banaras in 1905 why the Bengalis had not broken the heads of some of the officials who were oppressing the people. According to Bhupendra Nath Datta even Surendra Nath Banerji was eager to see the head of Bamfylde fuller blown off by a bomb and expressed delight when a bomb intended for the purpose was shown to him.[113]

There was, also, another important consideration. It was

felt that a rude shock was necessary to awaken the dormant manhood in India whose vitality was sapped by the Indian National Congress. When the great Moderate leader Aswini Kumar Datta heard from Abinash Chandra Bhattacharya about the secret revolutionary societies, he felt highly enthusiastic over it and told him : "We have grown old and lack the power. But you should shake this tree violently so that the birds may awake and chirp."

All these and perhaps other causes operated to give a stimulus to the activities of the secret societies. But the main inspiration came from the great national movement that swept over Bengal after the Partition. The people in general hoped to annual this measure by *Swadeshi* and Boycott movement. But it gradually dawned upon a large section of educated young men that these means were insufficient to achieve the desired end, and more violent means were necessary to gain their object. They had not the means to oppose the Government openly by armed resistance, and so they naturally fell back upon the secret societies as the only way to make preparation for it. Gradually their objective was no longer limited to the reversal of Partition, but extended to the attainment of independence.

In order to understand properly and assess rightly the activities of this militant group of young men, which will be described in another chapter, it is necessary to form an idea of the high principles which actuated them. Apart from intense patriotism and the spirit of sacrifice which formed the basis of new nationalism, they felt the call of higher life as expounded by Swami Vivekananda on the basis of the Vedanta. The firm faith in the immortal soul within led them to shed the fear of death and bodily pain. The religious attitude which made them realize God in the nation, i.e. in their fellow-countrymen, prepared them to sacrifice everything at the altar of the motherland. Guided by this spirit of making supreme saçrifice for the sake of the country they approached their task with a spiritual faith and cheerfully embraced death. The evidence on record shows that the following idealised picture of a patriot was literally true in numerous cases. "The patriot, when the call to self-immolation comes, rejoices and says : 'The hour of

my consecration has come, and I have to thank God now that the time for laying myself on His altar has arrived and that I have been chosen to suffer for the good of my countrymen. This is the hour of my greatest joy and the fulfilment of my life."

That this philosophy, based principally on the teachings of Vivekananda and old text like the *Gita*, profoundly influenced the young men are amply proved not only by their constant use of these books but also by the autobiography and memorandum of quite a large number of them. It is further proved by official reports that the *Gita* and the works of Vivekananda were very much in use by the "terrorists" and many copies of them were seized by the police in course of their searches.

A more concrete and positive evidence of the philosophy and mental attitude which fostered militant nationalism in Bengal is furnished by a study of the Bengali literature which formed the staple food for its sustenance. As noted before,[114] the famous novel of Bankim Chandra Chatterji, entitled *Anandamath*, formed the basis of this new spirit. It gives us the story of a band of Sanyasins who gathered together to rescue their motherland from the miseries of anarchy and oppression. The leader of the group, Satyananda, appears in the opening scene, alone, in a wild, dense, forest, praying to God for the fulfilment of his desire. He hears a voice asking what he is prepared to offer. Satyananda replies : "I shall sacrifice my life for the freedom of my country," The divine voice says : "No, that is not sufficient ; something more is necessary." Satyananda asks : "What more have I got ? What more can I give ?" The divine voice replies : "Devotion (*bhakti*)."

Satyananda and his followers tried to realize God through their country. They set up images of the different forms of the Mother Goddess and looked upon them as representing different stages in the evolution of the motherland. Their hymn to this mother Goddess opens with *Bande Mataram* (Hail Mother), but it is really a song addressed to Bengal, conceived not only as a geographical unit—full of green plants and sweet fruits, delicious water and cool breeze—

but as the fountain source of everything that is dear to man, viz. physical strength, spiritual devotion, knowledge, religion, feeling, perception—which are all personified in the image of the goddess, Mother Kali. "Who says 'the Mother is weak and helpless ?' Hearken to the war cry from seven crores of voices (population of Bengal in those days) backed up by the weapons held in hands, twice that number."[115] Such a curious blending of the physical and spiritual conception of the motherland is perhaps unique in the literature of the world, but it precisely connotes the sentiments underlying the *Swadeshi* movement. Bankim Chandra knew fully well that the imagery was quite new and altogether foreign to the Hindu ideas. Hence he took pains to make its meaning quite clear to the readers of his book. Mahendra, a character in the story, was a rich householder who accidentally meets the band of Sannyasins. When he heard them sing the devotional song '*Bande Mataram*' he exclaimed : "But this is not mother—it is the country" ; to which came the immediate reply : "A patriot knows no other mother, no other object of devotion."

The militant nationalism of Bengal was founded upon the twin rocks—the ardent patriotic call of Swami Vivekananda based on the philosophical teachings of Vedanta and *Gita*, and the religious devotion to motherland preached by Bankim Chandra through *Anandamath*. These works became the sacred canon of a small group of young patriots who were ready to sacrifice their all at the altar of their motherland. Many of them literally left their hearth and home and joined the secret societies in the spirit of the Sanyasins of *Anandamath*.

They were not, however, to depend for long on the works of Vivekananda and Bankim Chandra alone. Soon, during the *Swadeshi* movement, the new spirit found fuller expression through contemporary literature. As mentioned above, the *Swadeshi* movement opened a new era in Bengali literature, and the militant nationalism inspired songs and poems which became extremely popular. Though perhaps not always intended by the author, many of these struck the keynote of the spirit which created and sustained the "terrorist" movement.

The most obvious argument against "terrorism" is its

slender chance of success—its hopeless character, as noted in an extract quoted above from the writings of a leader of the Moderate school.[116] The attitude of the "terrorists" towards this is reflected in Arabinda's letter to his wife,[117] and also in the following song :

"Round whose Mother's neck clanks the chain,
Will he, too, stop to think .
If he be strong or weak ?"

Although this unequal struggle between a handful of young men and the mighty power of the British might appear hopeless to others, the followers of militant nationalism drew inspiration from divine dispensation. The idea is beautifully expressed by Rabindra Nath in a song, addressed to the British, from which we quote the following :

"Are you so powerful that you will flout and break
All laws of Providence ?
Are you so proud, you think you will
Break us and mould us ?
However firmly you may bind us,
The weak, they too have strength ;
However big you be, remember there is a God."

There was also a philosophic thought which gave comfort to the oppressed patriot in his hours of trial and suffering :

"As strongly they will bind us, so will our fetters snap ;
As redder grow their eyes, so clearer shall we see ;
The more they strike, the waves will higher rise."

That bold attitude involved extreme risk, even sacrifice of life, which is to be bravely faced without fear, is the burthen of too many poems and songs which were regarded as clarion calls to the youths of Bengal for martyrdom. The opening lines of a few are quoted below :—

First there is the call for sacrifice :

1. "Come all who'll mind not danger,
Death, oppression, accident or thunder,
Who looking steadfast on Mother's face,
Long, broken to bits, to die."

2. "Battered and sinking in sea, my boat I ply,—
Come all to-day who'd meet their death with me !"
Then comes the response :
1. "Devoted, valiant, we fear not to shed our own or other's blood !
In pride we hold our heads high,
And bend them low to Mother's feet alone."
2. "O Mother mine, may all my life
Pass on this earth in serving you,
Singing *"Bande Mataram"*.
You seek to make me forget my Mother
By beating me, even, hanging me !
I am not that kind of son,—
Bleeding wounds would give me strength :
Who will flee, leaving Mother behind ?
(lines 1-3).
Blessed shall I be, bearing indignities,
The lash, the jail, the gibbet !
(lines 1-3)"

These songs were sung all over the country and were construed as calls for martyrdom. They truly reflected the spirit which animated the secret societies and were utilized by them for gaining recruits. It would indeed appear as if some of Rabindra Nath's songs were specially composed to buoy up the spirits of the "terrorists". Their cult of bomb and revolver would naturally appeal at first only to a few daring souls, while the rest would sneer at them as mad men.[117] They were fully conscious of this and their attitude is expressed in the following song :

"He who calls you mad,
Say naught to him at all ;
For he who'll think you mad
And throw dust on you today,
Tomorrow morn he himself
Will surely follow your way."

But you must think thrice before you take to this path. The martyr should live on faith—"your victory is certain, Oh ! fearless hero." But there should be no hesitation, no inner

dispute, and sacrifice should bring its own cheer, without hope of fruit or reward. So the poet sings :

"Should misgivings trouble you, return from here ;
Should fears oppress you, come not, I say ;
If sleep enfolds your limbs,
You'll surely lose your way ;
If your hand shakes, the lamp you hold will fall.
And make all your comrades blind."

If there be no soul daring enough to keep his company, the martyr must not lose heart. So the poet sings :

"If none will come at your call,
Walk alone.
If no one holds a lamp for you,
If in this stormy night, in rain and dark,
All shut their doors,
Let your breast be riven by thunder-fire,
Yet walk alone."

True literature is a reflex of the mind. There is no doubt that the poems and songs with which Bengal was flooded after 1905 were inspired by the new spirit of sacrifice. But the two acted and reacted upon each other. While the literature reflected the prevailing spirit, it also helped to sustain it or even further its growth. Many members of Secret Societies are still alive.[118] They frankly admit that they were inspired by the poems and songs of which specimens have been quoted above. Some of them said that on many occasions, while going out for daring enterprises with imminent peril of death, they often cheered themselves up by reciting the following lines from Rabindra Nath's famous poem on the Sikh hero, Banda :

"The day has dawned at last,
When a million hearts have cast off fear,
And shed all burdens' weight,
When life and death our servants are,
And minds have snapped all chains."

When five Bengali youths fell fighting with the British forces on the bank of the Buribalam in Balasore District (Orissa),[119] many recited the following stanza from the poem with a slight alteration of the locality.

"So, on the banks of the Buribalam, streams of blood gushed out of the bodies of devotees. Like birds flying back to their nests, souls rushed out of their bodies to go to their own abode."

The depth and sincerity of the feelings which animated the spirit of militant nationalism may be gauged from contemporary Bengali literature. No other political movement, not even the Civil Disobedience and Non-co-operation campaigns launched by Mahatma Gandhi which stirred the whole of India, has evoked such response in literature. A few stirring poems, written in Bengali during the days of Non-co-operation, really reflected the old militant spirit of the *Swadeshi* movement, and were hardly compatible with the non-violent character of the later campaign. Here are some specimens :

1. "Helmsman ! Yonder on that Plassey's field,
Clive's sword was crimsoned by the blood of Bengal's sons ;
In yon Ganga's waters sank the sun of Hind,—
To rise again in the red glare of our blood.
Those who sang from scaffold the triumph of Life
Now crowd around us unseen,
What gory sacrifice shalt thou make ?"

2. "By dying in this land of death we'll bring
hope and life ;
Wearing the gallows' knot we'll laugh
the laughter that death defies.
Once more our bones will kindle thunder-fire."

3. Onward you heroes ; hearken to the call of life from every gate of death before ye. Break the bolt, march forward, march."

The real spirit of the Bengali poems and songs cannot be conveyed in English translations. One must read them in the original to get an idea of their true significance and of the fire it kindled in youthful hearts. But poor though the translations are, they would serve to demonstrate, beyond any doubt, that the militant nationalism—the so-called terrorism—was not the wild pranks of a few misguided youths, but the result of a

great national reawakening which profoundly swayed the people at large. It was a great movement that had its root deeply laid in the soil of Bengal. We know of epochs in Indian history when men of all classes left their hearth and home to seek spiritual salvation. Here we find the same phenomenon in Bengal ; only political salvation is substituted for spiritual. Like the wandering ascetics of old, these young men willingly forsook all that was dear and near to them, to carry on a life-long struggle for their goal. Fear of death, and physical sufferings worse than death, did not deter them ; obstacles and difficulties like Himalayan barriers could not deflect them from their course. Deserted by friends and relatives, ignored, if not derided, by their countrymen, without means or resources to keep their body and soul together, haunted by spies and hunted by police, flying from one shelter to another, these young men carried on heroic but hopeless struggle, from day to day, from month to month, and from year to year, They chose the life of hardship and privations and consecrated their lives to the service of their country. Many of them rushed headlong to destruction. They **died,** in order that others might *live*. We may call them emotional, unreasonable and unrealistic. But nobody can doubt either the depth of their feelings or the sincerity of their faith. That their compatriots never doubted it is proved by the homage paid to them both in private and in public. When the dead body of Kanailal Datta[120] was taken out from Alipore jail, thousands of men, women, and children formed a funeral procession to the burning *ghat,* and auspicious things like flowers and parched grains were showered by ladies from the balconies on the roadside. Bengal was in tears when Khudiram[121] was hanged, and the news of death of a revolutionary was a signal for mourning in almost every household

In no age or country are real martyrs of this type counted in large numbers. The people at large fight shy of the extreme path and keep aloof. Nor does every one of those who join the movement reach a high or ideal standard. But if we judge, as we must, by the conduct of the leaders and the general level maintained by their followers, we have no ground to withhold the praise, admiration and homage which they received

from their contemporaries. We are also bound to admit that militant nationalism in Bengal was not merely a passing phase in politics but a great movement that swept the country. Its material contribution to our political progress will be discussed in due course. But it would be a mistake to estimate its effect and importance by that test alone. The revolutionaries galvanized the political consciousness of the country in a way that nothing else could, and left a deep impress upon all the subsequent stages of our political advance. They really commenced the national struggle for freedom as we conceive it today. Posterity will not grudge them the laurels due to the pioneers of freedom movement in India. Even today when we think of the true national movement for freedom, our minds fly back, at one leap, clear over half a century, to those who conceived their country as Mother-goddess and worshipped her with their own lives as offerings.

XI. Some Special Features of the Swadeshi Movement

Before concluding this chapter it is necessary to discuss some special aspects of the *Swadeshi* Movement which have not been adequately deal with in the above account.

Some recent writers have sought to prove that the *Samitis*, mentioned above (p. 40), played an important role as the precursor of the mass movement which largely contributed to the achievement of freedom. This seems to be an exaggerated statement mainly influenced by current communist doctrine, as would be proved by the following account of the *Samitis* (Associations).

The *Samitis* that arose during the *Swadeshi* Movement must be distinguished from the already existing local political or semi-political associations, mostly on district levels and generally affiliated to a Central Provincial Organisation. The new types of *Samitis* were brought into existence mainly to popularize the Boycott and *Swadeshi*, but they gradually outgrew the original limits and became local associations for various types of social and economic, specially industrial, improvement, though purely political work was not always excluded from

their programme. The more distinguished among them carried on their social and humanitarian work throughout the year according to a definite programme, which included relief work during famine or any natural calamity like earthquake, helping the pilgrims to Gangasagar or similar religious gatherings, etc., but laid special stress on preaching *Swadeshi* through lectures (occasionally with magic lantern), patriotic songs and dramatic performances (called *Yatra*), organising *Swadeshi* schools, promoting indigenous arts and crafts and exhibition thereof in *melas*, social boycott of persons who used foreign goods, and in rare cases establishment of arbitration courts and *Panchayats* for settling disputes without going to the British courts. Special attention was also paid to the physical culture and moral training of the volunteers who formed the bulk or core of these *Samitis*.

A few Associations of this type existed even before the *Swadeshi* Movement, such as the Dawn Society in Calcutta started by Satish Chandra Mukhopadhyaya. Originally established in 1895 to impart religious instructions on orthodox Hindu lines, it soon became a strong centre in Calcutta of moral and intellectual training of highly educated youths, and also added an industrial section. It also published a magazine and was joined by several members during the *Swadeshi* Movement who attained great name and fame.

The great poet Rabindra Nath Tagore was at one time a great enthusiast for the establishment of Palli Samaj[122] in rural areas for giving practical training in self-help. The idea was catching and some other distinguished Bengalis made elaborate plan for making an elected Village Committee responsible for promoting education, sanitation, communication, irrigation medical treatment, etc., with special emphasis on promoting *Swadeshi* in all possible ways. Rabindra Nath himself set an example in 1904-5 by establishing such committees in the villages of his own Zamindari in Eastern Bengal (now Bangladesh). But perhaps as a result of experience, he seems to have lost faith and interest in these laudable endeavours. Many pamphlets were written with a view to popularising the ideas of establishing such societies in villages and district head-

quarters, but they did not last long nor produced any concrete results of great importance.

The *Swadeshi* Movement gave impetus to this type of *Samitis* and they tried to carry out its constructive programme by helping the growth of indigenous industry and national schools, making Boycott effective in various ways, carrying these ideas to remote and inaccessible villages among the masses, etc. A Police Report in 1909 gives a list of about 8,500 volunteers enrolled in the different Samitis all over Bengal, managing these Samitis.[123] Some of these like the 'Swadesh Bandhab Samiti' in Barisal exercised such a great influence upon the masses that the Government was alarmed and banned five principal *Samitis* in January, 1909. Generally speaking, however, these *Samitis* cannot be regarded in any way as a real awakening of the masses or even a precursor to the real mass movement. Thus, excepting the fact that some of these *Samitis* also served as breeding grounds and training centres as well as camouflage for terrorist movements they hardly exercised any influence on the Freedom Movement.

The same thing may be said of industrial strike of labour union which was a novel feature in Bengal during the *Swadeshi* Movement. The political leaders, probably for the first time, took advantage of labour discontent, due primarily to usual grievances about the scale of pay and condition of work, and tried to utilise them for political purposes. But such efforts did not play any important role during the *Swadeshi* Movement.

Another feature of the *Swadeshi* Movement, generally overlooked, is a strong tendency to invoke orthodox Hindu beliefs and practices to the service of the struggle for the liberation of Motherland. Obviously the *Anandamath* of Bankimchandra and its immortal song, *Bande Mataram*, with the devotion to the Goddess Kali displayed by the *Santans* or the band of patriots, served as the cue to the further development of the idea that the only means to reach the heart of the Hindu masses is through their religious beliefs. Even Surendra Nath Banerji made use of the Goddess Kali and her temple to make the people swear that they would only use *Swadeshi* goods and never buy foreign ones. The *Bande Mataram*, the most power-

ful organ of nationalism, extolled the caste system as furnishing a true pattern of Socialistic Society, "keeping awake in every class of society a sense of duty to it."[124] The service of the Hindu priests were utilised to make the people believe that the use of foreign-made sugar and salt would be a sin and a pollution requiring expiation. Social ostracism of persons using and traders selling foreign cloth also belongs to the same category. The revolutionarise used Bhavani-mandir (temple of the goddess Bhavani or Kali) as a suitable background for the organization of revolution. Even B. C. Pal, a Brahmo, openly preached that the national life should be based upon religious beliefs and the Hindus, Muslims and others in India should form distinct cultural units of a "composite nationalism."[125] Probably this view was based on the assumption that true patriotism can grow only on the foundation of the belief in the excellence and superiority of one's own country, religion and culture over those of other peoples. From this point of view he defended the worship of images on the occasion of the Shivaji festival held in Calcutta in 1906. In an article in the *Bangadarshan*[126] he wrote, in Bengali, the philosophy behind his views which may be rendered somewhat as follows : "According to many, national life should concern itself only with political and economic affairs, but to divorce it from religion would naturally lead the individuals also to lose sight of the spiritual ideals in life." It is quite clear that B. C. Pal was definitely against the conception of a purely secular State.

Much may be said both for and against this view, but it is beyond the scope of this book to discuss it in detail. The idea of a secular State has such a strong hold upon the Indian public that it is impossible to consider the problem in a dispassionate spirit, But it is well to remember, as pointed out in the first volume of this book, that Hindu nationalism is a legacy from the 19th century, and the concept may be regarded as coeval with that of nationalism itself in India. Further, it is an undisputed fact that though India is at present theoretically a secular State, religion still forms its only stable foundation. Even today almost every citizen regards himself as a Hindu or Muslim first, and then only, if at all, an Indian. So, much of the criticism of the *Swadeshi* Movmeent on the ground of its

Hindu character, which is undoubtedly a fact, must be tempered by the past and present history of India. It may also be questioned whether the *Swadeshi* Movement would have gathered such force and momentum but for its Hindu character.

BOOK III, CHAPER II.

The Swadeshi Movement

1. Cf. the case of Bipin Chandra Pal discussed on p. 139.
2. 'The Chinese were just at the time conducting a most successful boycott-campaign against American goods, to emphasize the indignation they felt at the exclusion of Chinese immigrants from the United States. If Chinese people were unable to enter America, American goods were to be unable to enter China. This boycott was reported to be 'most successful and to have inflicted heavy losses on American business.' Zacharias, *Renascent India*, 142.
3. *Mukherjees' Magazine*, 1873, pp. 110-111, 235; quoted in B. Majumdar, 280-1.

3a. Will Durant, *The Case for India*, p. 123.

4. Mukherjees, 42-3.
5. Ibid, 71.
6. Ibid, 104.
7. Ibid, 104-5.
8. See p. 21.
9. Mukherjees, 112-3.
10. Ibid, 223-4.
11. Ibid, 234.
12. See p. 20
13. *Nation*, 228-29.
14. Mukherjees, 60.
15. Ibid, 235.
16. See pp. 41-2.
17. Unpublished document.
18. Nevinson, 187-8.
19. Unpublished document.
20. Mukherjees, 64-7.
21. Ibid, 72.

22. Ibid, 61-2.
23. *MR*, V. 191.
24. Mukherjees, 223.
25. Ibid, 126-7.
26. Arabinda Ghose, *Bankim, Tilak, Dayananda*, 2nd Edition, 1947, p. 67.
27. Quoted in Mukherjee, 83-4,
28. For details, cf. Ibid, 85-6.
29. Ibid, 89-90.
30. Ibid, 90-1.
31. Ibid, 95.
32. Mukherjees-I, 27.
33. Mukherjees, 96-8.
34. Ibid, 100-1.
35. Ibid, 98-9.
36. Ibid, 100.
37. Ibid, 102-3.
38. Ibid, 102.
39. Mukherjees-1, 255-6.
40. Mukherjees, 105-7.
41. Ibid, 108.
42. Mukherjees-1, 34.
43. Ibid, 36.
44. Ibid, 37.
45. Mukherjees, 109.
46. Ibid, 110.
47. Mukherjees-1, 42-5.
48. Ibid, 47.
49. Ibid, 48.
50 Mukherjees-11, 82.
51. Muokherjees-1, 113-5.
52. Ibid, 173-4.
53. Ibid, 115.
54. Ibid, 116-7.
4a. Ibid, 117.
54b. Ibid, 127.
55. Mukherjees, 137.
56. Ibid, 138.
57. Ibid, 236. I. B. Records, L. No. 476-193, pp. 1-12.
58. Ibid. 235.
59. Ibid.
30. Mukherjee-1, 129.

60a. The origin of this institution bears a close resemblance to that of the national schools in Bengal. It was mainly due to the influence of Vishnu Govind Bijapurkar that the students of the Rajaram College, Kolhapur, left the Examination Hall because the ppers supplied to the students for writing answers were not of *Swadeshi* manufacture. Bijapurkar was dismissed for this and founded this national school.

61. Mukherjees-I, 132-3.
62. Ibid. 134.
63. Ibid, 135.
64. Mukherjees, 111.
64a. See pp. 40-41.
65. Mukherjees, 113-4.
66. Ibid, 116-7.
67. Ibid, 119.
67a. Ibid, 118-9.
68. Ibid, 120-1.
69. Ibid, 120.
70. Ibid, 122.
71. *Nation*, 220-1.
72. Ibid, 221.
73. Ibid, 222-3.
74. Ibid, 224-6.
74a. Morley, 152.
75. *Nation*, 222-3.
76. Ibid, 232.
77. Ibid, 231-2.
78. P. C. Ray, *C R. Das*, p. 57.
79. The above account is besed on official records, mostly unpublished.
80. Nevinson, 202. Although such persecutions had not yet assumed serious proportions, Nevinson very justly observed: "But it was the beginning of a dangerous road, to which one could not see the end, and knowlede that our own country was taking that (hitherto followed in Macedonia, Central Africa, Russia and the Caucasus) aggravated the sense of wrong". Subsequent events fully justified the apprehensions of Nevinson.
81. Ibid, 192.
82. O'Donnell, 72-3, 83.
83. Nevinson, 193.
84. O'Donnell, 67.

85. *Speeches of Surendra Nath Banerji*, Vol. VI. 400.
86. *Gokhale's Speeches*, p. 1133.
87. Cf. *Surendra Nath's Speeches*, p. 426.
87a. *New India*, 18 September, 1906.
87b. Report on the Native Press of Bengal (B) for the week ending 1 December, 1906.
88. *MR*, VI. 481.
89. *Surendra Nath's Speeches*, pp. 424 ff.
90. *Gokhale's Speeches*, p. 1114.
91. M. K. Gandhi, *Hind Swaraj*, pp. 15-8. In the Introduction to the Edition of this book; published in 1946, it is said that it was written in 1908, but J. S. Sarma says that it was written in 1909, on November, 13-22 (*Indian National Congress*, p. 443).
92. *MR*, I (1907), 137-42.
93. See above, p. 117.
94. *MR*, VI 481.
95. *Sedition Committee Report*, 23.
96. Chirol, *Indian Unrest*, (1910), 88.
96a. See above, p. 119.
97. Mukherjees, 140-43.
98. Cf. Vol. I. Bood II, Chapter V.A.
99. I am indebted to Mr. K. C. Sen for the English translations of some of these and other songs and poems at the end of this Chapter.
99a. See Vol. I, pp. 211-3.
100. See pp. 91 ff.
101. See Vol. I, pp. 380-82.
102. Mukherjees, 167.
103. For the account of the Shivaji Festival and the speeches quoted, cf. Mukherjees, 167-71.
104. *MR*, VIII. 458 ff.
104a. Cf. Vol. I, pp. 375 ff.
104b. This speech was published in the *New India*, edited by Pal himself, on 26 June, 1902. It was later incorporated in his book, *The New Spirit*, which was published in 1907. Curiously enough, the passage quoted above, and a few more extracts breathing the same spirit, were omitted, evidently because Pal was ashamed, in 1907, to publicly endorse the views which he had so eloquently expressed in 1902. This is very significant and may be regarded as symptomatic of the revolutionary change which the Partition agitation and the *Swadeshi* move-

ment had effected in Indian politics. Cf. Haridas and Uma Mukherjee, *Bipin Chandra Pal and India's Struggle for Swaraj*, pp. 12-13.

104c. Ibid, p. 14.

104d. Ibid, p. 21.

104e. Vol. I, pp. 389-90.

104f. This as well as the other extracts from B. C. Pal's writings and speeches quoted above are taken from Mukherjees, op. cit., pp. 11-21, which trace in detail the changes in his politiacl views.

105. See Chapter III, section I. B.

106. Vol. I pp. 429 ff.

107. Countess of Minto, 19-20.

108. Ibid, 150.

109. Ibid, 165. Minto to Morley, 23 November, 1907.

110. Ibid, 416-7.

111. Cf. Vol. I, p. 396.

112. A. C. Mazumdar, *Indian National Evolution*, pp. 227-8.

113. But cf. Chapter IX, section VII.

114. Cf. Vol. I, pp. 391 ff.

115. The text of this hymn has been quoted above, Vol. I, p. 393.

116. See p. 146.

117. An extract from this letter is published in *Bharat-purush Shri Arabinda* (Bengali) by Upendra Chandra Bhattacharya, p. 46. An English translation of this extract is given in Ch. III.

117a. Cf. above, p. 146.

118. That is, in 1956, when these lines were written.

119. This tragic incident has been described in Chapter VIII, Section III.

120. He was hanged for murdering, inside jail, the approver in the Alipore Bomb case. See Chapter VI., I 2.

121. See Chapter VI. I. 2.

122. *Swadeshi Samaj* (1904) *Rabindra Rachanavali*, Vol. III. *Avastha O Vyavastha*, Ibid,

123. Home Public Proceedings A, June 1906, n. 175. Home Political Proceedings, August, 1909, n. 26; and Appendix 1.

124. Editorial on 17 September, 1907.

125. *Swadeshi and Swaraj*, pp. 9-11, 85-7.

126. Sravana, 1313 B.S. (1906).

CHAPTER III

SPLIT IN THE CONGRESS

I. THE MODERATES AND THE EXTREMISTS

A. Difference in Theory

Reference has been made above, in Chapter II, Section IX, to the rise of two distinct parties in the Indian National Congress, known as the Moderates and the Extremists. It will be easier to understand the relative position of these two parties, if we state it in the language which was actually used by their own members at the time when the differences first arose. Of course, in the heat of discussions, each party described the other's programme in a language which was not always very elegant or polite. But, still, it is possible to get a fairly accurate idea of what each party felt about itself and its opponents, from the writings and speeches of the eminent persons of the two parties.

The real differences between the two parties lay primarily in the political goal to be achieved and the method to be adopted for achieving it.

As regards the goal, the ideal set up by the Congress was defined in 1905 as 'Colonial form of self-government,' but the Extremist's ideal was that of absolute autonomy free from foreign control. Shri Dadabhai Naoroji, in his Presidential address in 1906, defined the political goal of the Congress as "self-government or *Swaraj* like that of the United Kingdom or the Colonies." As this was not very clearly defined, each party interpreted it in its own way. The Congress had already accepted a resolution at its Banaras Session in 1905 demanding the Colonial form of Self-Government. The Moderates put this interpretation upon *Swaraj* as conceived by the President of the Congress in 1906. The Extremists were at first of the same opinion, but later interpreted *Swaraj* to mean complete autonomy without any dependence on the British rule.

As regards the method, the Extremist Party concentrated its whole attention upon the attainment of *Swaraj* or self-government. "Political freedom", said Arabinda, "is the life-breath of a nation ; to attempt social reform, educational reform, industrial expansion, the moral improvement of the race without aiming first and foremost at political freedom, is the very height of ignorance and futility." "Of the three possible lines of policy for the attainment of the goal, the New Party rejected 'petitioning' as mad and fantastic, for, as Arabinda put it, it is not in human nature that one people would sacrifice their interests for the sake of another. They also considered 'self-development and self-help' as vague and inadequate, and therefore advocated 'the old orthodox historical method of organised resistance to the existing form of Government.' Peculiarly situated as the country was, the New Party prescribed organized Passive Resistance as the only effective means, by which the nation could wrest the control of national life from the grip of an alien bureaucracy.[1] As mentioned above, this new theory was preached in Bengal before the annual session of the Congress in 1906. After the success achieved by the Extremists in that Congress against the opposition of the die-hard Moderates, the idea of Passive Resistance became the main plank in the policy and programme of the Extremists. Shortly after the Session of the Congress in 1906 Tilak undertook a whirlwind tour to preach this new doctrine. He addressed numerous meetings and the main burthen of his speech was somewhat as follows : He ruled out armed revolt as a possible method for gaining independence, for we have no arms. But he tried to show that the boycott, 'if properly carried out on a comprehensive scale, would prove a more formidable weapon.' He explained briefly what he meant by boycott as a political weapon as follows : "We shall not give them assistance to collect revenue and keep the peace. We shall not assist them in fighting beyond the frontiers or outside India with Indian blood and money. We shall not assist them in carrying on the administration of justice. We shall have our own courts, and when the time comes we shall not pay taxes. If you can do that by your united efforts, you are free from tomorrow."

Tilak also voiced the new cry of the Extremists, "put not your faith in the liberal ideals and benevolent intentions of the British." He ridiculed the Moderate Party's joy at the Liberal Government's advent to power in Britain and the appointment of Morley as the Secretary of State for India. "Do you mean to say", said he, "that when the whole Bureaucracy, the whole body of Anglo-Indians is against you, the Secretary of State will set it aside and give you some power?" Ere long the Extremist point of view, so lucidly explained by Tilak, proved to be almost prophetic, and 'honest' John Morley was helpless in the hands of the Bureaucrats.

Tilak explained the difference between the Moderates and the Extremists in very simple words. "I admit", Tilak used to say," that we must ask for our rights, but we must ask with the consciousness that the demand cannot be refused. There is great difference between asking and petitioning.....you must be prepared to fight in the event of your demand being turned down. Protests are of no avail. More protests, not backed by self reliance will not help the people.....Three P's—prayer, pleas and protest—will not do unless backed by solid force. Look to the example of Ireland, Japan and Russia, and follow their methods. We must show that the country cannot be governed well by the present method. We must convince the Government of this. Do not rely much upon the sympathy of the rulers."

Tilak bestirred himself by constant tours to bring home to the minds of the masses the fundamental difference between the methods of the Moderates and the Extremists. While the Moderates dared not openly condemn the Government, the Extremists in public meetings impressed upon the people how the alien Government has ruined the country and exploited its resources, and reminded them how they are looked down upon by the world, and foreigners openly feel surprised that three hundred millions of Indians patiently bear their present lot under a handful of the British.[1] Arabinda Ghose wrote a series of articles on "Passive Resistance"[1] in the *Bande Mataram* between 9 and 23 April, 1907. These contain a masterly exposition of the doctrine of 'Passive Resistance' which, later, in the hands of Gandhiji played an important role

in India's struggle for freedom. The following extract from one of these articles, published on 17 April, would convey a fair idea of the theory and programme of Passive Resistance :

"The essential difference between passive or defensive and active or aggressive resistance is this, that while the method of the aggressive resister is to do something by which he can bring about positive harm to the Government, the metho of the passive resister is to abstain from doing something by which he would be helping the Government. The object in both cases is the same,—to force the hands of the Government ; the line of attack is different. The passive method is especially suitable to countries where the Government depends mainly for the continuance of its administration on the voluntary help and acquiescence of the subject people. The first principle of passive resistance, therefore, which the new school have placed in the forefront of their programme, is to make administration under present conditions impossible by an organized refusal to do any thing which shall help either British commerce in the exploitation of the country or British officialdom in the administration of it,—unless and until the conditions are changed in the manner and to the extent demanded by the people. This attitude is summed up in the one word, Boycott. If we consider the various departments of the administration one by one, we can easily see how administration in each can be rendered impossible by successfully organized refusal of assistance. We are dissatisfied with the fiscal and economical conditions of British rule in India, with the foreign exploitation of the country, the continual bleeding of its resources, the chronic famine and rapid impoverishment which result, the refusal of the Government to protect the people and their industries. Accordingly,.....by an organized and relentless boycott of British goods, we propose to render the further exploitation of the country impossible.

"We are dissatisfied also with the conditions under which education is imparted in this country, its calculated poverty and insufficiency, its anti-national character, its subordination to the Government and the use made of that subordination for the discouragement of patriotism and the inculcation of loyalty. Accordingly, we refuse to send our boys to Government Schools

or to schools aided and controlled by the Government.....

"We are dissatisfied with the administration of justice, the ruinous costliness of the civil side, the brutal rigour of its criminal penalties and procedure, its partiality, its frequest subordination to political objects. We refuse accordingly to have any resort to the alien courts of justice, and by an organized judicial boycott propose to make the bureaucratic administration of justice impossible while these conditions continue. Finally, we disapprove of the executive administration, its arbitrariness, its meddling and inquisitorial character, its thoroughness of repression, its misuse of the police for the repression instead of the protection of the people. We refuse, accordingly, to go to the executive for help or advice or protection.....and by an organized boycott of the executive propose to reduce executive control and interference to a mere skeleton of its former self.....Ultimately, in case of the persistent refusal of the administration to listen to reason, the refusal to pay taxes is the strongest and final form of passive resistance."[2]

The theory of 'Passive Resistance' was further explained by Arabinda in his famous "An Open Letter to my Cauntrymen" published in the *Karmayogin* of 31 July, 1909.[3] This is looked upon as his 'Political Will', and one passage of it runs as follows :

"Our methods are those of self-help and Passive Resistance. The policy of Passive Resistance was evolved partly as the necessary complement of self-help, partly as a means of putting pressure on Government. The essence of this policy is the refusal of co-operation so long as we are not admitted to a substantial share and an effective control in legislation, finance and administration. Just as 'No representation, no taxation,' was the watchword of American constitutional agitation in the eighteenth century, so 'No control, no co-operation,' should be the watchword of our lawful agitation—for constitution we have none,—in the twentieth. We sum up this refusal of co-operation in the convenient word "Boycott", refusal of co-operation in the industrial exploitation of our country, in education, in govrnment, in judicial administration, in the details of official intercourse." The use of the word 'no co-operation' is signi-

ficant in the light of the non-co-operation movement launched by Gandhiji ten years later.

That the Moderates correctly understood this doctrine of Passive Resistance as the basic method of the Extremist Party, is clear from the following passage in an article written by Shri Chintamani.

"To realize this ideal they propose as effective methods the boycott of foreign goods, of paid honorary offices under Government, and of the Indian Universities and the colleges and schools affiliated to them ; the formation of trade unions and the promotion of strikes, so as, I presume, to bring to a deadlock British industries planted in India and paralyse British trade and commerce ;—in a word, obstruction is their method. This is the form of passive resistance which is in favour with them."[4]

Gokhale also clearly points out that the method proposed by the Extrmemists makes them a distinct and separate party. He says : 'The new party condemned all faith in the British Government as childish and all hope of any real progress under it as vain. Petitioning or a respectful representation of grievances to authorities was denounced as mere mendieancy. Boycott was to them the new weapon and its universal adoption was to bring us the realization of all our dreams". Gokhale, however, accepted the other part of the programme of the Extremists, namely, that 'love of the country should be the ruling principle of our lives, we should rejoice in making sacrifices for her sake, and that we should rely, whenever we could, on our own exertion.'[5]

The Moderate Party criticised both the ultimate goal set up by the Extremists as well as the method suggested and pursued by them. The Moderates held that the future progress of the country was possible under the aegis of British rule alone, and the reasons of this were the incapacity and disunion of the Indians.

Thus C. Y. Chintamani observed :

"The two weakest links in the chain are our incapacity and our disunion. With patriotism unknown to, and unrecognised as a virtue by, perhaps 99,999 people out of a lakh ; with education so little spread, with the ideas and ideals of the people

so time-worn and anachronistic, with so many racial and provincial differences still luxuriantly thriving, with the almost entire wamanhood of the country living in a world apart as it were, and knowing so little of, and caring so much less for, country and nation; with six crores of low castes not recognised as a part of the body-politic; with the myriad of castes and sub-castes and sub-sections of sub-castes into which the Hindus are divided and with the complicated and almost hope-killing Hindu-Muhammadan problem clogging the wheels of progress at every step....."[6]

Gokhale, the most gifted and eminent member of the Moderate Party, said: "Only mad men outside lunatic asylums could think or talk of independence."[7]

The following passage from one of Gokhale's speeches fairly sums up his view :

"Some have gone so far as to talk of independence as an object of practical pursuit. We owe it to the best interests of the country to resist the propaganda with all our resources. It means the sure destruction, or at any rate, the indefinite postponement of all these opportunities for slow but peaceful progress which are at present within our reach. There is no alternative to British rule, not only now but for a long time to come, and any attempts made to disturb it, directly or indirectly, are bound to recoil on our own heads. But the attainment of a democratic form of Government is bound to be a slow and weary affair—it must depend upon the average strength in the character and capacity of our people taken as a whole—and our average today is far below the English average. The most important work before us therefore now is to endeavour to raise that average."[8]

Similar views were expressed by others.

As regards the method, naturally the Moderates tried their best to defend the method which they had hitherto pursued. The Extremists scornfully described the method of petition as mendicancy, and Arabinda showed in a masterly article how it was bound to be infructuous, for the British democracy would never sacrifice its vital interests which the uplift of India necessarily involved. This was strongly opposed by the Moderates

and Gokhale, Dadabhai Naoroji and other less eminent leaders came forward to defend this time-honoured method called 'constitutional agitation.' Dadabhai observed that "petitioning is not begging for any favours any more than the conventional 'Your obedient servant" in letters makes a man an obedient servant. It is the conventional way of approaching higher authorities. The petitions are claims for rights or for justice or for reforms,—to influence and put pressure on Parliament by showing how the public regard any particular matter. The fact that we have more or less failed hitherto is not because we have petitioned too much, but that we have petitioned too little." It was further pointed out that petitioning method has not been altogether a failure, and reference was made to the Reforms Act of 1892. It was also contended that it was not possible to reject this method altogether, because in many cases, in the ordinary course of our life, we have to send petitions ; for example, we have to appeal to the High Court.

As regards the Passive Resistance, the general criticism was that the method hitherto followed by the Moderates need not exhaust the political activities of the Indians, and if anybody so chose, he could work outside the Congress any of the items included in Passive Resistance. It was further contended that all these items of activities were outside the function and capacity of the Congress. It was pointed out that political reform has been the only object of the Congress, and debate and deliberation, finding eventual expression in the shape of resolutions and memorials, have been its weapons.

But coming to the details, many Moderates pointed out that the items of Passive Resistance were more or less impracticable, at least in the shape in which the Extremists put them before the people.

The greatest opposition was, of course, to the boycott of English goods. The following passage from an article written by C. Y. Chintamani seem to have put the case of the Moderates very fairly :

"As the Hon'ble Mr. Gokhale has expressively put it, there cannot be a graduated boycott as there is a graduated income-tax. Boycott means a complete and sudden cessation

of commercial intercourse with the country the use of whose products is forbidden ; it is in effect a declaration of commercial war.

"Now what is the position to-day ? After eighteen months of boycott agitation, with patriotism at fever-heat, we import a larger quantity of cotton goods and of sugar, the two articles against which the boycott is principally directed, than we did at the commencement of the agitation. In the birth-place of the boycott agitation, I mean the province of Bengal, they have not succeeded in keeping out even an article of luxury, which is further productive of harm, foreign cigarettes, in spite of patriotic vows innumerable, and self-denying ordinances many.

"Will anybody tell me what we are to do, what we have it in our power to do, when provoked by the manner of the boycott agitation, the Government of India will impose a duty of 20 to 30 per cent. on imports of, say, textile machinery ? Instances of gross fiscal injustice have been many in the past, probably there will be no lack of them in the future ; the more so if we provoke them into acts of resentment. The boycott of foreign goods is at present impossible, and agitation directed to that end, futtle."[9]

It was further pointed out by Mr. Mudholkar that the boycott can be adopted only when the bulk of the nation is prepared to completely withstand and meet the reprisals which a political boycott is bound to provoke.

As regards the boycott of paid and honorary offices under Government, it was pointed out that those who knew Indian character and Indian conditions would certainly regard it as most impracticable. The boycott of Government office by those who hold them now would be of no avail as others would fill their places. The same argument applies to the honorary offices. If one Indian resigns his place, hundred fellow-countrymen of his would apply for the post within 24 hours.

As regards the boycott of Indian universities and the educational institutions affiliated to them, it was pointed out that it would be a suicidal folly to deprive the people even of those meagre facilities which they at present possess in the hope

of starting new intsitutions which may or may not be of a more improved character.

As regards strikes and trade unions, it was pointed out that the country was not yet ripe as was amply proved by the fate of the Railway Union and Printers' Union and a few such other mushroom organisations brought into existence in Bengal. It was also pointed out that there was no good reason to lose faith in the justice and good sense of the British ; though not much result had been achieved by the Congress, we should remember that twnty-one years, though a long time in the life of an individual, was a very short period in the life of a nation. It was argued that the Government might have an honest difference of opinion, and therefore we ought not to give way to despair because our wishes were not granted as quickly as we might desire. It was concluded that we should not call into question the honesty of purpose of those in authority over us, nor should we lose faith in our endeavours to obtain our ends. It was pointed out that although the Irish had far closer association with the English, their long agitation for Home Rule had not yet borne fruit, and if Ireland has failed to achieve its end after struggle for nearly a century, there was no cause for despair or adverse criticism of the Congress because it had failed to achieve its end within only twenty-one years.

The Moderate leaders had also another weapon in their store. They could easily show that some of the most prominent leaders like Tilak and Khaparde held, not long ago, exactly this view about petition or constitutional agitation, which they now called 'mendicancy'. Mr. Mudholkar pointed out the utter irreconcilability of what was said by Mr. Tilak in December, 1904, and Khaparde in April, 1905, with what they were saying in 1906. He observed :

"Mr. Tilak has now been attacking Mr. Gokhale and others for using the term "constitutional" in regard to India and has been inquiring where was the charter (Sanad) creating such a constitution. In the issue of his paper, the *Kesari*, dated the 2nd January, 1906, he points out that the Queen's Proclamation of 1858 is our charter. And then comes a sentence containing sentiments for uttering which derision is now poured on and odium sought to be created against the Moderates. The

sentence runs thus : 'Taking our stand on this charter and guiding ourselves by the generous policy observable in statesmen like Mr. Gladstone, and by the strength of our own fitness we shall slowly and slowly but certainly obtain the rights of self-government enjoyed by the Colonies.'

"On 22nd April, 1905, Mr. Khaparde delivered an address as President of the Central Provinces and Berar Provincial Conference. The following excepts from it will speak for themselves : 'I feel that we ought all to feel exceedingly grateful to Government for its attitude of complete toleration and neutrality towards movements of this kind.....

'Though there is a foreign Government, it is even along national lines, and what is more, all the people, educated or otherwise, have accepted it is national.

'It is said that continuous agitation and discussion for 20 years in the Congress has led to no appreciable results, and, therefore, there must be something radically wrong with our methols.....

'All this and much more that may be added need not discourage us. Constitutional methods are always dilatory in their operations even in Great Britain, much more are they, therefore, likely to be dilatory in India."[10]

Mudholkar's charge cannot be regarded as a scrious one, for a political leader or party has every right to change views in altered circumstances. Indeed Mudholkar himself admits this when he says : "It is not questioned that they have altered their former views honestly."[10a] But his criticism is very important from one point of view. In enables us to date the real birth of the Extremist Party some time in 1906, and unerringly points to the influence of Arabinda in ushering this new view as a definite creed in politics.

The Moderates were not satisfied by merely criticizing the views of the Extremists. They attributed also some deliberate evil designs to them. Thus Shri Bhal Chandra Krishna wrote :

"They (Moderates) are sensible that extreme demands will never be granted and will only retard our progress. They see that the present temper of the British Government in England and India is favourable to our advancement, and they are therefore anxious that the cause of the country should not be

spoilt by any unworkable or disagreeable claims. The so-called progressives, on the other hand, would rather not have any concessions granted, and would of set purpose pitch their demands to the utmost extent, so as to make their refusal certain. In fact their programme is to abstain from making any demands whatever. Their professed object is to embarrass the Government and to heighten its unpopularity by making it appear that it refuses to make popular concessions. It is difficult to see what possible good they hope to attain by such tactics."[11]

Generally speaking, the arrguments put forward by the Moderates were rational and logical, and, on the face of it, appeared quite unassailable. But the real standpoint of the Extremists was based on the new creed of nationalism which was being preached by Shri Arabinda, Tilak, Lajpat Rai, Bipin Chandra Pal and others, to which reference has been made above. They did not try to meet the individual arguments of the Moderates, but their main point was that it was time that we should come to regard politics more seriously and as part of our religion ; and we should approach it with "that power of faih and will which neither counts obstacles nor measures time."

This would be evident from the long passage from the Bombay speech of Arabinda which has been quoted aboye.[12]

Referring to the fears of repression he said :

"Storm has swept over us today. I saw it come, I saw the striding of the storm blast and the rush of the rain and as I saw it an idea came to me. What is the storm that is so mighty and sweeps with such fury upon us ? And I said in my heart, 'It is God who rides abroad on the wings of the hurricane,—it is the might and force of the Lord that manifested itself and His almighty hands that seized and shook the roof so violently over heads today'. .....Repression is nothing but the hammer of God.....without suffering there can be no growth.....They do not know that great as he is, Aswini Kumar Datta is not the leader of this movement, that Tilak is not the leader,—God is the leader.....It is because God has chosen to manifest Himself and has entered into the hearts of His people that we are rising again as a nation.....It will move forward irresistibly ur God's will in it is fulfilled."[13]

Arabinda thus took politics on the much higher plane of spirituality. He regarded patriotism as a form of devotion, and expressly said that to the new generation the redemption of their motherland should be the true religion, the only means of salvation. To one approaching the political problem from this point of view, it was impossible to think or talk of possibilities of failure or to count losses and gains in terms of the Moderates. Arabinda explictly put this idea in a letter to his wife : "If a demon sits on the breasts of my mother and is about to drink her blood, shall I sit idle and coldly calculate whether I have the strength enough to fight it ? My only duty is to rush to the rescue of my mother,"[14] "In a similar spirit," he observed, "the Indians should approach the political question ;—their prime duty was to save the Motherland. It was for them to rush head-long to achieve this goal without pausing to think of its probable success or failure."

To what extent Arabinda's ideas took shape in the minds of the party may be gathered from an article, entitled "The National Outlook, the Great need of the Situation", by Lajpat Rai. As it contains a brilliant exposition of the ideals and methods of the Extremist Party in a language more intelligible to ordinary people than that of Arabinda, a long extract from it is given below :—

"In my opinion the problem before us is in the main a religious problem—religious not in the sense of doctrines and dogmas—but religious in so far as to evoke the highest devotion and the greatest sacrifice from us. Our first want, then, is to raise our patriotism to the level of religion and to aspire to live or to die for it. We believe in religion for the sake of the truth in it which is to secure for our souls communion with God. There, in the presence of our God, we forget our tiny selves, the pettiness of our minds, and rising above the same, drink from the pure fountain of bliss and love. In the same way, let the edifice of patriotism be raised on the solid rock of truth and justice. In worshipping truth and justice let us be honest and bold, regardless of wordly losses and gains. Let the people first learn to think honestly and boldly. This will in course of time be followed by honest, bold and truthful words, and the latter by honest, bold and inspiring deeds.

"The first step of the political ladder, then, consists in our educating the people in a school of true politics, of our initiating them into a religion of true patriotism with a creed of Nationality, Liberty and Unity, to be believed and striven after with all the sincerity of heart and devotion, worthy of the oriental mind.

"Let us next proceed to examine the forces that are likely to oppose us in our propaganda. Here, again, the greatest danger is in my opinion, from within and not from without.

"To the Government there are only two paths that are open—a system of terror or a system of concessions. The latter possesses more possibilities of success than the former. A system of terror invariably recoils over the heads of those that resort to it, and I am confident that the British are sufficiently wise not to forget that there is a great deal of truth in what is so often quoted by European revolutionists that 'Blood calls for Blood, and the dagger of the conspirator is never so terrible as when sharpened on the tomb-stone of a martyr.'

"A system of small concessions, however, might be more effectful to stem the rising tide of nationality. There probably lies a greater danger to the rapid growth of the idea of nationality in the country than in a system of repression.

"Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji exhorts us to agitate and agitate. I say, Amen ! but on the clear understanding that agitation is an educational duty which has to be performed regardless of success in the shape of concessions. Let the public be accustomed to agitate for the sake of agitation and not in the hope of getting any immediate redress. That is, in my opinion, the only way to ward off disappointments and to prepare the people for more effective methods of political activity. Our esteemed countryman, Mr. Tilak, advises the people to make the work of administration on the present lines impossible by passive resistance. I say, that is only possible by training the people to a habit of suffering for principles, i.e., to dare and to risk ; and by infusing in them a spirit of defiance wherever a question of principle is involved. The way is to be shown by personal example and not by precept alone. There is the old truth, 'no risk no gain'. The line of least resistance, of

empty resolutions on a paper, of simple resolutions, memorials, and not petitions backed up by anything which would place our earnestness beyond the shadow of a doubt, is a line of action more worthy of women than of men. If I may be permitted to question the political leaders of the country, what irresistible proofs have they up to this time given of their earnestness for the political demands made by them ?

"If, however, we have not wasted 22 years on political agitation and if the *Swadeshi* and Boycott are not lip-platitudes to be indulged in for the edification of our audiences, let us now take to it seriously and give incontestable proofs of our earnestness for political privileges.

"Hitherto the political movement has only been carried out by fits and starts. It has completely depended on the moments of leisure which gentlemen, engaged in learned professions and business, could conveniently spare for the same. It has been a labour of love to them, but it has always occupied a secondary position in their thoughts. The country has so far failed to produce a class of men whose chief and prime business in life will be political agitation and political education. The chief and crying need of the national movement is the coming forward of a class of earnest, sincere, able and devoted men, who will move about the country freely and preach the Gospel of freedom, both by word of mouth as well as by example—men who will win over the masses to the cause of Truth and Justice, by words of wisdom and lives of service. The non-existence of this class at the present moment, combined with other difficulties, makes the national outlook very gloomy indeed, but the remedy to change the face of things lies in our own hands."[15]

As regards the goal of completet independence *versus* colonial self-government, it was pointed out, even by those who did not fully subscribe to the Moderate doctrine, that there was no harm even for the Extremist to accept the colonial self-government as a step to the ulterior goal. They pointed out that as neither of these two goals is likely to be achieved in the near future, it was futile to create a split on the issue of this remote ideal, and that if the Extremists adopt for the time being colonial self-government as their ideal, it does not prevent them in any way from trying to achieve full independence after

colonial self-government is attained. This was no doubt a counsel of wisdom, but the new spirit of nationalism would not brook it and a frank exposition of it was given by Arabinda in many of his speeches.

"There are some", said he, "who fear to use the word "freedom", but I always used the word because it has been the *mantra* of my life to aspire towards the freedom of my nation."[16]

Again, "Our ideal is that of *Swaraj* or absolute autonomy free from foreign control. We claim the right of every nation to live its own life by its own energies according to its own nature and ideals."[17]

It may be mentioned here that the position taken up by Arabinda may be supported by the point of view expressed by many eminent writers in Europe. As an instance, we may refer to the classical work of Morley—*On Compromise*. The principle enunciated in this book shows the strength of the Extremist point of view, and at the same time demonstrates the utter inconsistency of Morley when he said, as the Secretary of State for India, with reference to the Extremists, that those who are not satisfied with small concessions and ask for more and more, "really cry for the moon."

The last lines of the last chapter of Morley's book read as follows :

"A principle, if it be sound, represents one of the larger expediencies. To abandon that for the sake of some seeming expediency of the hour, is to sacrifice the greater good for the less, on no more creditable ground than that the less is nearer. It is better to wait, and to defer the realisation of our ideals until we can realise them fully, than to defraud the future by truncating them, if truncate them we must, in order to secure a partial triumph for them in the immediate present. It is better to bear the burden of impracticableness, than to stifle conviction and to pare away principle until it becomes mere hollowness and triviality. What is the sense, and what is the morality, of postponing the wider utility to the narrower ? Nothing is so sure to impoversih an epoch, to deprive conduct of nobleness, and character of elevation." An Extremist could hardly improve upon these words in defending their position.

Because Indians were not satisfied with Mr. Morley's small reforms, which were often the opposite of reforms, Mr. Morley placed them in the same category with those who cry for the moon. But in the same book, referring to the French saying that small reforms are the worst enemies of great reforms, Mr. Morley observes that in a sense that is profoundly true in two ways :

(1) 'A small and temporary improvement may really be the worst enemy of a great and permanent improvement, unless the first is made on the lines and in the direction of the second. And so it may, if it be successfully palmed off upon a society as actually being the second'.

(2) 'In a different way the second possible evil of a small reform may be equally mischievous where the small reform is represented as settling the question. The mischief here is not that it takes us out of the progressive course.....but that it sets men's minds in a posture of contentment, which is not justified by the amount of what has been done, and which makes it all the harder to arouse them to the new effort when the inevitable time arrives.''[18]

The position of Arabinda is also fully vindicated in the following passage which occurs in Lord Acton's essay on Nationality :

"The pursuit of a remote and ideal object, which captivates the imagination by its splendour and the reason by its simplicity, evokes an energy which would not be inspired by a rational, possible end, limited by many antagonistic claims, and confined to what is reasonable, practicable, and just.

"Only the attraction of an abstract idea, or of an ideal state, can unite in a common action multitudes who seek a universal cure for many special evils, and a common restorative applicable to many different conditions. And hence false principles which correspond. with the bad as well as with the just aspirations of mankind, are a normal and necessary element in the social life of nations.''[19]

A fair specimen of the views held by responsible public men who did not belong to any political party will be found in the following extracts from the review of the Presidential address of Dadabhai Naoroji in Calcutta Congress by Ramananda

Chatterji, editor of the *Modern Review* : "After half a century of struggle and disappointment, Mr. Naoroji still hopes that 'the British conscience will assert itself.' He must have reason for the faith that is in him. At the same time we must not forget that in mundane affairs large masses of people are influenced oftener by fear and self-interest. It is for this reason that we wish our national strength to be developed in all directions, so that our rulers may feel that unless justice be done, effective retaliation is sure to follow. We lay stress on the word 'effective'. The Bengal boycott has not been effective, nor the Bengal strikes. Both boycott and the strikes as political weapons are threats. If you threaten, you must be in a position to carry out the threat. Else it is worse than useless. It is for this reason that we are at this stage of our national life and feeling opposed to the declaration of the extension of the boycott as a political weapon to provinces other than Bengal. In the meantime every patriotic Indian should practise the economical boycott as far as possible.

"The best way to convince statesmen that certain reforms are urgently needed is to give them object lessons that a smooth working of the administrative machinery of the country is impossible without those reforms. An appeal to their sense of justice is good, but these object lessons are not superfluous, if only by way of stimulating their sense of justice. But it may be urged with some show of reason that as we are weak and the British Government and people are so immeasurably strong, we ought not to do anything which will rouse their resentment, we ought not to think of even lawful retaliation. But the initial mistake is in thinking that we are weak. No. I am weak, may be true. But it is never true to say that we are weak, provided you have got the right to say "we". In political grammar, a mere aggregation of many units do not make a "we" ; but the one unit consisting of many members is rightly called "we'. And that "we" is never weak."[20]

In conclusion reference may be made to the views of those few individual Englishmen who, true to the traditions of Burke, Macaulay, Bright, Fawcett, Cotton and others, were sympathetic to the political aspirations of India. A fair specimen is supplied by an article entitled "Home Rule for India" written

in 1907 by John Page Hopps. The point of view of an individual Englishman, outside the "official and ruling classes who almost entirely determine Great Britain's policy", is thus described by him :

"As for 'Home Rule for India', that is a cry which has not yet even reached him : and very few Englishmen pronounce it. It has yet to win acceptance by the rank and file even of 'Pro-Boers'. But, apart from the cry, good progress has been made with the idea, and tens of thousands of thoughtful Englishmen are getting thoroughly ashamed of our autocratic, masterful and selfish grip of India. Still, it may mislead to insist too strongly on the desire of Englishmen to be just. That is not the ruling passion in England. The liking for power, and a certain unctuous belief that English rule is best for everybody, dominate the abstract desire to be just.

"What then is to be done ? If one Englishman may give advice to India's millions, I think it should be this : India must be its own Saviour. The best course for India is the bold course. She must refrain from pleading for trivial relaxation, and boldly set forth the larger claim, and insist upon it, night and day. Set up associations and unions to do, to actually do, as self-help, much of what legalised Home Rule might be supposed to do. Let the National Congress introduce some kind of unbroken continuity in its work. Encourage Home Trade as a preliminary to Home Rule. Put not your trust in princes, and in State Secretaries. These are usually but puppets in the hands of unseen powers behind them. You cry, "What must we do to be saved" ? The only answer is, 'He that believeth shall be saved.' Let Indian patriots believe."[21]

Indirectly this constitutes a great support to the Extremist view. On the whole, the Extremist Party, created by the *Swadeshi* movement, was definitely forging ahead. The following doggerel verse, very popular in 1907-8, probably represents the view of the general public

Repression comes, but lingers,
And we linger on the shore,
And the Moderates wither,
And Extremist is more and more.[22]

To Arabinda Ghose is due the chief credit for this triumphal emergence of the Extremist Party, and the virtual extinction of the Moderate Party which was shortly to follow. His early life has been described above.[23] He was inspired by Swami Vivekananda to consecrate his life to the service of his mother-land. He was still in Baroda when the *Swadeshi* movement was started. He came to Bengal early in 1906 to study the political stituation, and attended the Barisal Conference, but took no active part in it. On his return to Baroda he gave a short description of the terrible scene at a public meeting. But what he saw and heard during his recent visit to Bengal brought him out from the isolation in which he had hitherto led his life. He decided to make Bengal the centre of his activities. When the National Council of Education, organized in March 1906, set up under it the Bengal National College and School in August, 1906, Arabinda became its first principal. In accepting this appointment he had to make considerable pecuniary sacrifice. But Arabinda gradually veered round to politics. With the growth of the Extremist Party, the initiative of the new spirit generated by the *Swadeshi* movement and neo-nationalism gradually passed from the hands of old leaders like Surendra Nath into those of Arabinda and Bipin Chandra who were always in touch with Tilak and Lajpat Rai. These four were the great leaders of the new movement, but Arabinda soon gained the position of supremacy. This was mainly through the daily paper, *Bande Mataram*, mentioned above (p. 76). The following tribute paid by J. L. Banerji to Arabinda and the *Bande Mataram* may be regarded as a fair assessment :

"The *Bande Mataram* leaped into popular favour almost in a day, and soon achieved for itself a remarkable position in the field of Indian journalism. The vigour and energy of its style, the trenchant directness of its tone ; the fearless independence of its attitude, the high and inspiring ideal which it held up before the people, its passionate faith in the genius of the country—all combined to root the new paper in the hearts and affections of its ever-widening circle of readers. Moreover, the people knew that *Bande Mataram* was their very own—no organ of any clique, set or faction, but wide as Indian nationality itself. No newspaper that we know of has ever evoked such

passionate personal enthusiasm as the *Bande Mataram* did during its short tenure of life.

"Whoever the actual contributor to the *Bande Mataram* might be—the soul, the genius of the paper was Arabinda. The pen might be that of Shyam Sundar or who not—the world did not care about it ; but the voice was the voice of Arabinda Ghose : his the clear clarion notes calling men to heroic and strenuous self-scarifice ; his the unswerving, unfaltering faith in the high destinies of his race ; his the passionate resolve to devote life, fame, fortune, all to the service of the Mother.

"Two very unfortunate things happened at this time ; but unfortunate as they were, they had a material influence upon the position of Babu Arabinda Ghose. One was the imprisonment of Babu Bepin Chandra Pal for the offence of contempt of Court ; the other was the death of the Upadhyaya Brahmabandhab, while still undergoing trial on a chagre of sedition. The removal of these two notable personalities was a great blow to the cause of the New Movement, but, at the same time, their removal left Arabinda the undisputed leader of the Nationalist Party in Bengal. It was as leader of the Nationalists that Babu Arabinda Ghose took part in the Midnapore District Conference of November, 1907, ...a Conference made memorable by the first open rupture between the Moderates and Extremists of our Province. And it was as leader of the Nationalists again that Babu Arabinda Ghose went and took part in the unfortunate Surat Congress of the same year.

"After the dissolution of the Surat Congress, Arabinda made a long tour in Bombay and the Central Provinces, speaking at all important places on Nationalism in its manifold aspects. From this tour he returned to Calcutta in the latter part of January, 1908. And a little more than three months after, on 2 May, he was arrested, handcuffed, and dragged to prison, on a charge of treason and conspiracy."[24]

Arabinda underwent a protracted trial as an accused in the Alipore Bomb case. After remaining in jail as an undertrial prisoner for more than a year, he was acquitted on 6 May, 1909. But a great change came over him during the seclusion of his jail life. He gave up active politics and took to a life of religious meditation, in which, he conceived, lay the true

path of India's salvation. He edited a new journal, called *Karmayogin*, for preaching his new views. But he did not altogether eschew politics. He made a strong appeal to his countrymen not to be lured by the Morley-Minto Reforms. The Government suspected that he was still connected with the terrorist movement and decided to deport him. Having got some inkling of it Arabinda secretly left Calcutta, and after staying for some time in hiding at Chandernagore, proceeded to Pondicherry where he spent the rest of his life as a spiritual *guru*. But he never ceased to keep an watchful eye on India's struggle for freedom. He lived long enough to see his country free, and died in 1950.

In this connection reference may be made to the assessment of Arabinda's character and abilities by Mr. Ramsay Macdonald in the following passage : "I called on one whose name is on every lip as a wild extremist who toys with bombs, and across whose path the shadow of the hangman falls. He sat under a printed text : 'I will go in the strength of the Lord God' ; he talked of the things which trouble the soul of man ; he wandered aimlessly into the dim regions of aspiration where the mind finds a soothing resting-place. He was far more of a mystic than a politician. He saw India seated on a temple throne. But how it was to arise, what the next step was to be, what the morrow of independence was to bring to these things he had given little thought."[25] But this is not a far assessment of a mystic whose inner thoughts cannot be divined. As a matter of fact Arabinda had a much clearer idea as to what should be the future politics of India than most of the leaders who shaped her destiny. By way of illustration we may refer to his advice to the Congress to accept the proposals of Cripps.[25a] The Congress rejected it at the time but many of its leaders admitted later that Arabinda was right.

B. Difference in Action

As the *Swadeshi* movement gained in momentum, it was apparent that the Moderates in Bengal were unable to keep pace with the Extremists and the two were gradually drifting apart. This became first evident in their respective attitude to

the scheme of national education. While the Moderates expressed sympathy with the establishment of the National Council of Education, though not unoften in a half-hearted manner, they were definitely opposed to the idea of boycotting schools and colleges under the Calcutta University. The idea of such a boycott, however, appealed to the younger generation. Surendra Nath, as already mentioned above, became unpopular for opposing this idea. He was even reported to have called the supporters of the boycott traitors to the country. The erstwhile leader of Bengal fell in the estimation of the younger section, and they naturally veered round B. C. Pal and other Extremist leaders who supported the boycott of Calcutta University.

The Moderates heartily disliked the Extremists and their leaders, particularly Bipin Chandra Pal, and the Extremists reciprocated the sentiment. Each party wanted to capture the key-positions in the political organizations. There were ugly wrangles over the appointment of office-bearers in the Indian Association. The Moderates succeeded in preventing men like Tilak and Lajpat Rai from becoming President of the Congress in 1906 and 1907.

The difference became further manifest in the Congress session at Varanasi held in 1905. Hoping against hope the Moderate Party had sent, early in that year, Gokhale and Lajpat Rai on deputation to England. They returned sadder but wiser, without being able to achieve anything. This may explain why Gokhale, in his Presidential address at Varanasi, declared "self-government within the empire as the goal of India." He made highly appreciative references to the partition agitation as a landmark in the history of our national progress. He justified the boycott as a political weapon to be used only at the last extremity, and with strong popular feeling behind it. Speaking of the *Swadeshi* movement Gokhale said :

"The devotion to Motherland, which is enshrined in the highest *Swadeshi*, is an influence so profound and so passionate that its very thought thrills and its actual touch lifts one out of oneself. India needs to-day above everything else that the gospel of this devotion should be preached to high and low, to prince and to peasant, in town and in hamlet, till the Service of

Motherland becomes with us as overmastering a passion as it is in Japan."

Lajpat Rai was more outspoken. He told the Congress delegates and visitors that the British people were indifferent to Indian affairs and the British press was unwilling to champion Indian aspirations So India had to achieve freedom by her own efforts alone. Thus did Lajpat Rai put in a nutshell the main difference between the Moderates and Extremists.

The difference came to a head over the resolution on 'Boycott'. There was perfect unanimity among the members in condemning the partition of Bengal and a resolution was adopted to that effect. Surendra Nath Banerji, while moving the resolution, vividly described the plight of the Bengalis caused by the repressive measures of the Government, and gave expression to the grief and excitement as well as anger and defiance of the people of Bengal. "Their agitation", he said amid cheers, "would never stop until the Partition was cancelled." Strong speeches were made by delegates from other Provinces expressing sympathy with Bengal in her dire distress, and voicing the indignant protest, anger, and the determination of India. The Indian National Congress had seldom witnessed such a scene of excitement before.

But there was no such unanimity on the 'Boycott' resolution. The Bengal delegates, particularly the Extremist or Nationalist section, desired that the Congress should give its seal of approval upon the Boycott Movement. But, as mentioned above, Moderate leaders were averse to it as it was in conflict with the policy of petition and persuasion which they had hitherto pursued.

A proposal approving of Boycott led to an acrimonious discussion in the Subjects Committee, and its fate hung in the balance, when the Bengal delegates hit upon a device to coerce the Moderates. The Moderates proposed to send a message of welcome to Their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales during their forthcoming visit to India. But the delegates from Bengal opposed it on the ground that Bengal was in tears and could not receive the Prince with a smiling face. The Moderates could not think without horror that the resolution for such a loyal message would be opposed in the public session

of the Congress. They were sure of getting it passed by a majority of votes, but the absence of unanimity would take away the grace and charm of such a message.. At last both sides yielded to a considerable degree and a compromise was effected. The Bengal delegates agreed to leave the Congress pandal before the resolution about the message was moved, so that it might be unanimously passed. On their side the Moderates offered an indirect support to the Boycott Movement and agreed to the following resolution :

"That this Congress records its earnest and emphatic protest against the repressive measures which have been adopted by the authorities in Bengal after the people there had been compelled to resort to the boycott of foreign goods as a last protest, and perhaps the only constitutional and effective means left to them of drawing the attention of the British public to the action of the Government of India in persisting in their determination to partition Bengal, in utter disregard of the universal prayers and protests of the people." It is significant that speakers supporting the resolution recounted the examples of China and Ireland.

Though the differences between the two sections of the Congress were composed for the time being, it was gradually becoming clear that the Nationalist ideas and feelings were too pronounced to be easily accommodated within the framework of the Congress. So, after the session was over, the advanced section of the Nationalist delegates held a Conference within the Congress campus and formed a new Nationalist Party. It decided to remain within the Congress but with a distinct programme of its own.

The speeches made in the Conference left no doubt about the nature of this programme. It definitely abandned the policy of 'mendicancy' or 'petition' hitherto pursued by the Congress, and boldly adopted the ideas of Boycott in a comprehensive sense and Passive Resistance which meant "withdrawal of all kinds of co-operation from the British rulers in every sphere of administrative and public activity." After the Congress session was over, Tilak and B. C. Pal went on a lecture tour to popularise these new ideas. Mr. Pal's lectures in Madras were very remarkable and produced deep impression upon the people

all over India and the Government The following may serve as a fair specimen :

"You may get a High Court judgeship here, a membership of the Legislative Council there, possibly an Executive Membership of the Council. Do you want a larger number of Indians in the Civil Service ? The whole Civil Service might be Indian, but the Civil Servants have to carry out orders. The supplanting of Europeans by Indian agency will not make for self-government in this country.

"They say, 'Can you boycott all the Government Offices ?' Whoever said we would ? What we can do is this. We can make the Government impossible without entirely making it impossible for them to find people to serve them. The administration may be made impossible in a variety of ways." One of the ways suggested was the social boycott of Government officers.

An altogether new tone was thus introduced in Indian politics which largely anticipated the policy and programme of Mahatma Gandhi fifteen years later. This type of political propaganda attracted many recruits, specially among the younger generation, and swelled the number of the new Nationalist Party.[25b]

II. THE CALCUTTA SESSION, 1906

Two events outside India, in 1905-6, had some repercussions upon the Moderates and the Extremist. The astounding victory of Japan over Russia gave a strong stimulus to the latter ; for it was now proved that the Europeans were not invincible and the Asiatics could be their match in every field. The Moderates were buoyed up with the resounding victory of the Liberal Party in the General Election in Britain. Gokhale exultingly remarked after his visit to England that "a strong current has already set in there against that narrow and aggressive imperialism which only the other day seemed to be carrying everything before it." The whole Moderate party pinned its faith on the new Secretary of State for India, John Morley—"the reverent student of Burke, the disciple of Mill, the friend and biographer of Gladstone."

In Bengal, the Moderates were steadily losing ground and a small incident showed how the two parties were gradually drifting apart from each other. A meeting was summoned by the Moderates in Calutta on 31 January, 1906, "to memorialise the Liberal Seretary of State for India, Mr. Morley, with the prayer that Bengal be raised to the status of a Presidency Government as provided for in Parliamentary statutes." The renewed advocacy of the policy of prayer and petition by the Moderates made the students utterly dissatisfied and indignant. This was followed by another Town Hall meeting organised by the advocates of the cult of self-help in national entetrprises."[26] Thus step by step the gulf between the Moderates and Extremists was widened.

Throughout the year 1906 an acrimonious controversy was carried on through periodicals by the spokesmen of the two parties, as both looked forward to a decisive trial of strength in the forthcoming session of the Indian National Congress in December, 1906. Although Morley had very badly let down the Moderates, as will be related later, still the old veterans of Congress stood in a solid phalanx against the newfangled ideas of the Extremists, particularly the anti-Government attitude displayed in their adoption of the Boycott and National education.

But the Extremists in Bengal had also gathered strength. Eminent leaders like Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Lala Lajpat Rai and Khaparde from outside had joined the party. Bipin Chandra Pal had risen to the height of his stature and preached the new policy of his party through his eloquent speeches—both in English and Bengali,—and vigorous thoughtful writing in his weekly organ, the *New India*. He was ably aided by Brahmabandhab Upadhyaya, who created a new colloquial Bengali style suitable for the masses, and his message, put in an inimitable form all his own, had an immediate and profound appeal to all ranks. Above all, the Extremist Party had an accession of immense strength when it was joined by Arabinda Ghose, who proved to be a host in himself. Indeed the entry of this new personality in the Congress arena may be regarded as a major event in Indian politics. Arabinda's articles in the *Bande Mataram* put the Extremist Party on a high pedestal

all over India. He expounded the high philosophy and national spirit which animated the Party, and also laid down its programme of action. But far more valuable to the Extremist Party than even his discourses, was his striking personality Fired with religious fervour he preached nationalism as a religion, as noted above, and he, the prophet of this new religion, infused by his precept and example, courage and strength into everyone that came in touch with him. His emergence in Indian politics was as sudden as it was unexpected. Of him it may be truly said that he awoke one morning and found himself famous, or that he came, he saw, and he conquered. He rose like a meteor and vanished like it,—from the political atmosphere. But unlike the meteor the dazzling light he shed on Indian politics did not vanish with him. The torch which he lighted continued to illumine Indian politics till it passed into the hands of worthy successors who led it to its destined goal.

So, the Congress met in Calcutta on 26 December, 1906, in an atmosphere far more tense than that at Banaras a year ago. The Moderates had scored a triumph over the Extremists in the matter of selecting the President. Any leader of the new party, or one sympathetic to it, was unacceptable to the Moderates. Yet his eminence and services to the country might be such as to make the choice desirable and popular, and ungenerous, if not difficult, for the Moderates to oppose him if nominated by the Extremists. It was actually in the air that the Extremists would propose the name of Tilak. To avoid such difficulty, the Moderates forestalled any move on the other side by persuading Dadabhai Naoroji, then 82 years old, to accept the Presidentship of the Congress. The name and fame of the Grand Old Man, as he was called, and the services he had rendered to his motherland made it impossible for the Extremists to demur to this proposal, though they would have preferred a person like Tilak or Lajpat Rai in his place.

The attendance at the Session was very large. There were 1663 delegates and the visitors numbered about 20,000 something unique in the history of the Congress up to that time.

The President's speech showed that he was altogether out of touch with the new spirit that was animating India. He

reiterated the grievances against the British rule and the remedies against them such as had been repeated *ad nauseam* since the foundation of the Congress and for many years before that. The only method for political fight was, he said, agitation.

His watchword was 'agitate, agitate and agitate'. It was the dying declaration of their political principle by the Moderates which was destined never more to be heard from the platform of the Indian National Congress, properly so called. "Agitation", he declared, "is the civilised peaceful weapon of moral force, and infinitely preferable to brute, physical force." Strangely enough it sounds like the words of Gandhi, but—and it is a great 'but'—with the substitution of agitation for *Satyagraha*.

The only redeeming feature of the President's speech was the reference to *Swaraj* as the goal of India. This word, destined to be the war cry of India for the next forty years, was used by Tilak in the nineties, but was uttered for the first time on the Congress platform by Dadabhai Naoroji. But he did not choose to define *Swaraj* or explain what he meant. So, as mentioned above, the Moderates and the Extremists put different interpretations upon it, the former taking it to mean self-government on Colonial lines and the latter, full and absolute autonomy.

The chief interest of the Congress session of 1906 centred round the proposals of the Extremist Party regarding *Swadeshi* and connected problems. There was a great deal of excitement in the Subjects Committee, and ultimately four draft resolutions were agreed upon and passed in the open session. But it did not go off without an open hitch. Some members of the left wing or advanced section of the Extremist Party felt dissatisfied and, in the heat of the debate, rushed out of the Subjects Committee meeting.

The resolution on the Partition asked the British Government to reverse or modify it. Surendra Nath Banerji, while seconding it, expressed his disappointment that John Morley, the biographer of Cobden and Bright, instead of acting according to the unanimous views of the Indians had declared the partition of Bengal as a settled fact. But Surendra Nath had not yet

lost all faith in 'honest John' (Morley) and even offered some excuses for his conduct.

A great deal of heat was generated in course of the discussion of the next resolution :

"That having regard to the fact that the people of this country have little or no voice in its administration, and that their representations to the Government do not receive due consideration, this Congress is of opinion that the Boycott Movement inaugurated in Bengal by way of protest against the Partition of that Province, was, and is, legitimate."

Bipin Chandra Pal seconded the resolution in a vigorous speech, and said that it was not a mere boycott of goods, but one of honorary offices and associations with the Government in East Bengal. Not one leader of the people would associate with the Lieutenant-Governor in any legislative work. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya objected to Mr. Pal's interpretation of Boycott, extending its scope. Gokhale clinched the issue by pointing out that they were bound by the words of the resolution and not by an individual speech.

The resolution on *Swadeshi* ran as follows :

"That this Congress accords its most cordial support to the Swadeshi movement, and calls upon the people of the country to labour for its success, by making earnest and sustained efforts to promote the growth of indigenous industries and to stimulate the production of indigenous articles by giving them preference over imported commodities even at some sacrifice."

The last 11 words were the most crucial and were not to the liking of the Moderates. The resolution on National Education read as follows :

"That in the opinion of this Congress the time has arrived for the people all over the country earnestly to take up the question of National Education, for both boys and girls, and organise a system of education—Literary, Scientific, and Technical—suited to the requirements of the country, on National lines and under National Control."

The Congress also passed a resolution on self-government the first para of which ran as follows :

"That this Congress is of opinion that the system of Government obtaining in the self-governing British Colonies should

be extended to India, and that, as steps leading to it, it urges that the following reforms should be immediately carried out." (The rest of the resolution specified the reforms which the Congress had been demanding year after year, such as simultaneous examinations for the I.C.S., the expansion of the Supreme and Provincial Legislative Councils, and an adequate representation of the Indians on these as well as on the Executive Councils of the Governor-General and Governors, and the Council of the Secretary of State).

The resolution, like that of Boycott, was evidently the result of a compromise. The first para or the substantive part of the resolution shows the influence of the new nationalist school of thought. But the modifying clause, which blunted the edge of the main part, was the handiwork of the Moderates. The resolution was on a par with the goal of *Swaraj* declared by the President. This expression was left vague and indefinite, while the ideal of self-government in the resolution, though definite, was only held out as a distant goal, the immediate concern being the reforms suggested in the following paras. So, for all practical purposes, it did not differ much from the usual resolutions demanding reforms which were passed by the Congress year after year. This is evident from the fact that both the mover and the supporter of the resolution made very short speeches, and it evoked no enthusiasm among the audience. Nevertheless, as the first enunciation of the national demand for self-government by the Indian National Congress, a great deal of importance attaches to the resolution.

The Congress of 1906 is an important landmark in India's struggle for freedom. By adopting the resolutions on Boycott, *Swadeshi*, and National Education, the Congress definitely accepted, *in toto*, the programme of the *Swadeshi* movement and identified itself with it. How much all this went against the time-honoured principles of the Moderates may be judged from the fact that in 1905 they dared not accept, and in 1907 were anxious to repudiate, the resolutions adopted in 1906 by the Congress, and for the next ten years they deliberately eschewed them. It is true that the Nationalists could not carry them in the form in which they desired, but none the less;

even the passing of the resolutions as they stood was a triumph of the Extremist Party.

Secondly, it was quite clear that the old leaders of the Moderate Party, who had the Congress in the hollow of their hands, ceased to enjoy the old respect, reverence and unquestiond obedience. As Arabinda Ghose put it, "the reverence has been transferred from persons to the ideal of the motherland, it is no longer Pheroze Shah Mehta or even Dadabhai Naoroji who can impose silence and acquiescence on the delegates of the nation by their presence and authority, for the delegates feel that they owe a deeper reverence and a higher duty to their country."

Thirdly, the ideal of *Swaraj*, as self-government, was termed by Dadabhai Naoroji in an inspired moment, became the watchword of the nation. To quote again from Arabinda's review of the Congress of 1906:

Dadabhai declared *Swaraj* "to be our one ideal and called upon the young men to achieve it. The work of the older men had been done in preparing a generation which was determined to have this great ideal and nothing less; the work of making the ideal a reality, lies with us. We accept Mr. Naoroji's call and to carry out his last injunctions will devote our lives and, if necessary, sacrifice them."[27]

The Calcutta session of the Congress in 1906 also gave rise to a trend of thought, which, though not altogether new, came to occupy a prominent place in the future political programme of the Nationalists. This would be clear from the long passage quoted above,[28] which was published almost immediately after the Congress session.

III. THE SURAT SESSION, 1907[29]

In the Calcutta session of the Congress there was a compromise between the Moderates and the Extremists. But like most compromises it satisfied neither party and left behind a strong current of discontent and disaffection. This manifested itself in a keen controversy in the press and on the platform throughout 1907, between the two parties over their respective aims and methods, particularly over the resolutions passed on

self-government, *Swadeshi*, Boycott, and National Education. The spirit in which this controversy was carried on seems to have convinced the Extremists that the Moderates would make an attempt to omit those resolutions, or at least whittle them in the next session of the Congress. The Extremists soon found tangible evidence that their fear was not unfounded. In the Provincial Conference held at Surat in April, 1907, the resolutions on "Boycott" and "National Education" were excluded from the programme of the Conference, and it was believed by the Extremists that this was due to the personal influence of Pheroze Shah Mehta who had a great following at Surat. Towards the end of the year, the same fear was further enhanced by the incidents at the District Congress Conference, held at Midnapur (Bengal). Surendra Nath tried his best to convince Arabinda that the Moderate policy would not only bring about the re-union of Bengal but even a great measure of self-government within a short period. Arabinda, however, did not yield. Rowdyism broke out on account of differences between the two parties, particularly on the refusal of the Chairman to discuss *Swaraj*, and the police had to be called in to restore order.

It had been decided in the Calcutta session that the next annual session of the Congress in 1907 would be held at Nagpur. When the preliminary arrangements were being made there, acute differences between the two parties were evident at the meeting of the Reception Committee over the election of the President. The meeting broke out in confusion and the venue of the Congress was shifted to Surat. It was inevitable that the Extremists should interpret this move as a desire to facilitate the triumph of the Moderates in the next Congress session. For Nagpur was a stronghold of the Extremists, and the Reception Committee at Surat would presumably be composed largely of Pheroze Shah Mehta's followers.

Again there was much diffrerence over the selection of President. The Extremists suggested that Lajpat Rai, who had just been released after deportation, should be elected President to mark the country's indignation and protest against the unfair treatment 'accorded to 'him by the Government, but he was not acceptable to the Moderates

who chose Dr. Rash Behari Ghose for the post. The situation was saved by the patriotic action of Lajpat Rai who declined to be a mere pawn in a political game. But this showed the Extremists which way the wind blew, and their suspicions were further confirmed by the fact that the list of subjects likely to be taken up for discussion by the Surat Congress, officially published about 10 days before the date of the Congress session, did not include the subjects of Self-government, Boycott and National Education. Tilak, who arrived at Surat on 23 December—three days before the Congress session—denounced this retrogade step, and the Extremist Party, led by Tilak and Arabinda, decided to frustrate it at any cost. Opinions differ—mostly on party lines—as to the successive stages of negotiations between the two parties that followed. But one thing seems beyond dispute. Tilak made it quite clear that his party would not oppose the election of the President if they were assured that the resolutions passed in the Calcutta session on Self-Government, Boycott, and National Education would not be modified in any way at Surat. It is equally clear that the Moderate leaders refused to give any such assurance even at the risk of an imbroglio that might break up the Congress, and the excuses so far offered for their failure to do so are absolutely unconvincing.

It was in this atmosphere that the 23rd Indian National Congress commenced its proceedings at Surat on 26 December, 1907, at 2-30 p.m. It is difficult to give a true account of the proceedings of the Congress session at Surat, because different, and on many points contradictory, statements have been made, mainly on party lines. The following narrative based on all available records seems to the author to be the nearest approximation to truth.

The Extremist Party held a conference on 25 December and decided that if the resolutions adopted at the Calcutta session regarding Self-government, Boycott, Swadeshi Movement and National Education are modified in any way they would oppose the election of the President "only by solidly and silently voting against it in a constitutional manner."

The session of the Congress began on 26 December, but the delegates had not been supplied with copies of draft resolutions

until that afternoon. Gokhale ascribed the delay to printing difficulties, but the Extremists had good reasons for believing that the delay was deliberate. For even a cursory glance at the draft showed that very substantial modificaton has been made in the resolutions adopted at the Calcutta session.

In the Calcutta resolution on the Swadeshi Movement the people were called upon to give preference to indigenous over imported goods even at some sacrifice. The last four words which were introduced in Calcutta as a compromise after a long and heated discussion were omitted in the draft. Similarly the words "the Boycott Movement inaugurated in Bengal" were replaced by the words "the boycott of foreign goods resorted to in Bengal", thus denying the wider aspects of the movement like boycott of administrative machinery, which were implied in the Calcutta resolution and were stressed in the speeches of Tilak and some other leaders. Again, in the resolution on National Education which called upon the people to organise a system of education "on national lines and under national control", the last seven words within inverted commas were omitted.

These two preliminary points must be borne in mind in order to clearly understand the causes and nature of the troubles responsible for the break-up of the Congress session at Surat.

The proceedings began on 26 December, 1907, at 2-30 p.m. Opinions differ about the number of delegates who actually attended. "A historian estimates the number at 1200, of whom the Nationalists (Extremists) numbered 500. Mrs. Annie Besant stated that it was 1400; H. P. Mody writes in the biography of Sir Pherozeshah Mehta that the delegates numbered 1600; but Sri Aurobindo asserts that 'the Moderates brought a crowd of 1300 while the Nationalists were able by the same method to muster something over 1100."

"When the session of December 26 began with the speech of the Chairman of the Reception Committee, draft resolutions had not yet been distributed and the house heard him with satisfaction. Then the name of Dr. Rash Behari Ghose was proposed for the office of President. As soon as this was proposed, some voices were heard in the hall, shouting 'No', 'No' When Surendra Nath stood for seconding the proposal

there was a great uproar from a section of the delegates, and as, in spite of repeated appeal for 'Order', no heed was paid to it and Surendra Nath was unable to go on with his speech on account of the disorderly shouts, which, it was made clear, would not cease until an assurance was given that the resolutions about Swadeshi, Boycott and National Education would not be modified. As it was found impossible to continue the session, the Chairman suspended the sitting for the day.

In the evening another Conference of the Extremists authorised the Committee, appointed on the previous day, to carry on negotiations for maintaining the *status quo* about the disputed resolutions ; failing which it was decided either to move an amendment to the proposal to elect Dr. Rashbehari Ghose as the President, or to vote against the proposal. At about 8 p.m. Chunni Lal Saraya, Vice-Chairman of the Reception Committee, in his unofficial capacity, approached Tilak for meeting Gokhale to settle the differences. Tilak readily agreed and Chunni Lal left to consult Gokhale ; but he never returned. Next morning Tilak made a suggestion through a common friend to the effect that immediately after the proposal of election of the President had been seconded, he (Tilak) would move an amendment for adjournment and appointment of a Committee consisting of one Moderate and one Extremist from each province to arrive at a settlement which would be binding upon all. The friend undertook to carry the proposal to Pherozeshah Mehta. Returning after about half an hour he informed Tilak of the failure of his mission.

Then, at about 12-30 Tilak wrote in pencil the following note to Mr. Malvi, the Chairman of the Reception Committee :

"Sir, I wish to address the delegates on the proposal of the election of the President after it is seconded. I wish to move an adjournment with a constructive proposal. Please announce me". Not having received any reply to his note Tilak sent a reminder through N. C. Kelkar, but even this did not bring any reply.

The Congess met on the 27th at 1 p.m., and the proceedings were resumed at the point at which they were interrupted the day before. So Surendra Nath seconded the proposal for the election of the President and Motilal Nehru supported it. There

were loud voices of 'Aye', 'Aye', from the assembled delegates, but a minority also shouted 'No', 'No'. The Chairman thereupon declared the motion carried, and Dr. Ghose rose to read his address. At this stage Tilak came upon the platform and urged that he must be permitted to move the motion of which he had already given notice to the Chairman of the Reception Committee. Mr. Malvi now told Tilak that his motion was out of order, but Tilak refused to accept this decision and decided to appeal to the delegates. By this time, there was an uproar in the pandal, and while the President tried to read his address, Tilak kept shouting that he must move his motion and would not allow the proceedings to go on unless he was permitted to do so. The uproar naturally increased, and the two sections, the Moderates and the Extremists, were shouting at each other at the top of their voices. This was followed by a general disturbance, in course of which, it was alleged, an attempt was made to remove Tilak bodily from the meeting; but is was maintained on the other hand, that there was a general movement among Tilak's followers to rush to the platform, with sticks in their hands. All that is definitely known is that in the general melee that followed, chairs were flung and a shoe was hurled from the pandal which struck both Pheroze Shah Mehta and Surendra Nath. The President, finding that the disorder went on growing, suspended the session of the Congress *sine die*. The different versions of the incidents, respectively by the Moderates and the Extremists, noted above, radically vary from each other. As a result of careful study and critical assessment of the available data, the following may be said to be the nearest approximation to truth.

The hurling of the shoe which hit Surendra Nath and Mehta was a signal for general disturbances. Chairs were seen being lifted to be thrown at Tilak ; Tilak's followers, brandishing their sticks, rushed towards the platform, and a free fight ensued. Thereupon the President adjourned the Assembly *sine die*.

It was alleged by the Extremist leaders, including Arabinda, that the Moderates had made arrangements the previous night to dismiss the Nationalist Volunteers and hired Borah or Muhammadan goondas. These, with *lathis*, were stationed at

various places in the pandal and took part in the scuffle. The Moderates alleged that "among the Extremist delegates and visitors taken from Berar were gymnastic teachers, proclaimed touts, workmen from factories, fitters, oilmen, etc., who created the trouble." In a joint statement the Extremist leaders contended that "Tilak had certainly a right to appeal to the delegates in support of his motion for adjournment, and Tilak was deprived of this right by the Chairman by not sending a reply to his letter and hurrying up the election of the President. The silent hearing given by the Extremists (Nationalists) to Mr. Banerji on the one hand, and 'the circulation of an inflammatory leaflet against Tilak and the hiring of the goondas on the other, further prove that if there was any pre-arrangement anywhere for the purpose of creating a row in the pandal, it was on the part of the Moderates themselves." According to the Bombay C.I.D. Report, the shoe that struck Surendra Nath and Mehta were really hurled at Tilak, and there is evidence to show that inflammatory leaflets in Gujarati exhorting the readers to teach a lesson to the Mahratta leader Tilak were distributed widely in the city of Surat and even in the Congress pandal itself.

There are good grounds for the belief that the shoe was hurled at Tilak. M. R. Jayakar states "that the shoe was hurled at Tilak and adduces the evidence of more than one person who vouched on their word of honour that they saw the shoe hurled by a Poona follower of Gokhale". G. K. Khaparde wrote in his Diary: "A Moderate, I think Ambalal, threw a chair at Tilak. This enraged all our party. A shoe thrown by a Moderate at Tilak struck Surendra Babu on the back and Sir Pherozeshah M. Mehta on the Cheek." On the 28th December an attempt was made to arrive at a compromise and Tilak formally gave in writing the assurance that he and his party were prepared to waive their opposition to the election of Rash Behari Ghose as President and were prepared to act in the spirit of forget and forgive, provided firstly, the last year's resolutions on *Swaraj*, *Swadeshi*, Boycott and National Education, were adhered to and reaffirmed, and, secondly, such passages, if any, in Dr. Ghose's speech (already published in newspapers, though yet undelivered) as may be offensive to the Nationalist party were omitted. Tilak's letter was taken to the

Moderate leaders, but no compromise was arrived at. A convention of the Moderates was, therefore, held in the pandal the next day, which the Extremists were not allowed to attend even when some of them were ready and offered to sign the declaration required. The Moderates eventually decided to have no connection in future with the Extremists. The Convention passed a resolution appointing a committee of over a hundred persons to draw up the constitution of the Congress.

The one outstanding fact that strikes an impartial critic on going through the whole episode is that even after the rowdy scenes on the first, day, which left no doubt of the impending danger, the Moderate leaders refused to allay the suspicions of the Extremists by explaining their own attitude towards the resolutions in question. This can lead to only one conclusion, namely, that the Extremists rightly apprehended that the Moderates really wanted to modify those resolutions. In other words, they allowed the suspicion to grow, with evil consequences, because the latter knew that *truth* would be far worse than suspicion.

One may well wonder why the Moderates insisted on changing the resolutions even at the risk of a split in the Congress rank. There is little doubt that this was due, at least to a large extent, to the influence of John Morley and Lord Minto.

IV. INFLUENCE OF THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT UPON THE MODERATES.

How the policy of the Moderates was influenced by Morley, is very clearly revealed in the following extract from a letter of Morley to Minto, dated August 2, 1906: "Yesterday I had my fifth and final talk with Gokhale.....'For reasonable reforms in your direction', I said, to him, 'there is now an unexampled chance. You have a Viceroy entirely friendly to them; you have a Secretary of State in whom the Cabinet, the House of Commons, the press of both parties, and that small portion of the public that ever troubles its head about India, reposes (sic) a considerable degree of confidence. The important and influential Civil Service will go with the Viceroy. What

situation could be more hopeful ? Only one thing can spoil it : perversity and unreason in your friends. If they keep up the fuss in Eastern Bengal they will only make it hard, or even impossible, for Government to move a step. I ask you for no sort of engagement. You must of course be the judge of your own duty, and I am aware that you have your own difficulties. So be it. *We* are quite in earnest in our resolution to make an effective move. If your speakers or your newspapers set to work to belittle what we do, to clamour for the impossible, then all will go wrong. That is all I have to say'.

"He professed to acquiesce very cordially in all this and assured me that immediately after my Budget speech he had written off to his friends in India and pitched a most friendly and hopeful note."[30]

It is important to note that when Gokhale agreed 'cordially' to remove the only obstacle to reforms by putting down the Extremists, he could have no illusion as to the British policy towards India. In the course of that very talk Morley had already plainly told him, in respect of his ultimate hope of India's attaining the status of a self-governing colony, "that for many a long day to come—long beyond the short space of time that may be left to me—this was a mere dream." That the Moderates rallied round the Government even with this knowledge explains the basic difference between them and the Extremists.

Gokhale's tacit agreement with Morley explains the strong opposition of the Moderates to the resolution in the Congress session of 1906 supporting Boycott advocated by the Extremists. It also explains the sudden outburst of bitter controversy between the Moderates and the Extremists after the Congress Session of 1906 and its continuance throughout the year 1907.

It appears that though the Moderates could not go the whole hog with the Government, they tried to recover the lost ground as much as possible by cutting adrift from the Extremists which Morley held out as *sine qua non* for the grant of reforms. There is also no doubt that since the beginning of 1907 the Moderates practically left the Extremists in the lurch and veered round to the Government. The following extract from Minto's letter to Morley, dated March 19,1907, makes it quite clear :

"My best item of news I have kept till the end of my letter.

I think I told you that I was to receive a Deputation of Mahommedans and Hindus. They came to see me last Friday, and of all the wonderful things that have happened since I have been in India, this, to my mind, was the most wonderful. The Deputation consisted of the Maharajah of Darbhanga, Surendra Nath Banerjee, Mr. Chowdry, a Member of Congress, Narendra Nath Sen, Editor of the *Indian Mirror*, and three Mahommedan gentlemen. The burden of their conversation was that they are most anxious to put an end to unrest and bad feeling, and that they propose to organize associations throughout the country with a view to inducing Mahommedans and Hindus to work together for the control of their respective communities.....It was simply marvellous, with the troubles and anxieties of a few months ago still fresh in one's memory, to see the "King of Bengal" sitting on my sofa with his Mahommedan opponents, asking for my assistance to moderate the evil passions of the Bengali, and inveighing against the extravagances of Bepin Chandra Pal. I hope you will forgive me a little feeling of exultation at the confidence expressed in me by these rpepresentatives of hostile camps, and their declaration of faith in you, Mr. Hare, and myself.

"I was tempted to gush off a note of triumph to you at once. But one never knows what may happen next, and a letter by the next mail seemed safer than an impulsive wire."

Later, after a second Deputation, Minto wrote to Morley :

"Gokhale was very reasonable. He pressed of course for increased representation and amendments to the Budget, on the ground that there is at present an utter want of reality in the Budget discussions. He asked for two Native Members on the Viceroy's Council and three on the Secretary of State's. He says that the whole younger generation of India is going over to the extremists' side ; that they are quite unreasonable and attracted by the idea of getting rid of British rule, which is the doctrine preached to them : that the glamour of the British Raj, which in the old days fascinated the people, has departed, and that the only way to recover our moral control is to do something that will appeal to the Native imagination."[31]

After all this it is difficult to believe that the invisible hands

of Morley and Minto did not pull the strings from behind the scene when the great split between the Moderates and the Extremists took place at the Surat session of the Congress. It would not be unreasonable to infer from what has been said above about the Surat Congress, that the Moderates deliberately provoked quarrel with the Extremists and threw away every reasonable chance of compromise. This is fully supported by the following extract from the letter of Morley to Minto, dated 31 October, 1907 :

"One of the most interesting things that have come my way this week is a letter from Gokhale, dated October 11. The one absorbing question, he says, is how the split in Congress, now apparently inevitable is to be averted.....

"I have often thought during the last twelve months that Gokhale, as a party manager, is a baby. A party manager, or for that matter any politician aspiring to be leader, should never *whine*. Gokhale is always whining.....Now, if I were in Gokhale's shoes—if he wears shoes, I forget,—I should insist on quietly making terms with the breaucracy on the basis of Order plus Reforms. If he would have the sense to see what is to be gained by this line, the "split" when it comes should do him no harm, because it would set him free to fix his aims on reasonable things, where he might get out of us sixty or seventy per cent. of what he might ask for."[32]

V. REPERCUSSIONS OF SURAT CONGRESS

Even after the fiasco at Surat Tilak made earnest efforts for a reunion. But the Moderates were furious and would have nothing to do with Tilak and looked upon him as a traitor. The Moderate press heaped abuses upon him : "Tilak had been feeding the flames which have burnt the Congress to ashes. He is not a patriot, but a traitor to the country, and has blackened himself. May God save us from such patriots." In spite of vile abuses of this type Tilak continued to make appeals for reunion in his paper *Kesari* in the following strain : "It is a mistake to suppose that a difference of opinion as to ultimate ideals should prevent Indians from co-operating with one another,

for gaining a common end. We see that Radicals, Socialists, Democrats and others, though labouring for widely differing ideals, are able to co-operate with one another in Parliament in advancing the interests of their country as a whole. With this example before our eyes, does it not betoken a lack of liberality to insist that representatives of a certain school of Indian politicians should alone be admitted to the Indian National Congress ? The duty that lies before our politicians is not to seek to eradicate all differences of opinion, but to secure the co-operation of men holding divergent views for the accomplishment of common ends. Whatever our differences may be about the ideals, we, Moderates and Extremists, should unite in carrying the work of the National Congress. The rise of a new party necessarily produces friction with the old, but it is the duty of wise men not to make much of this friction but to carry on national work in co-operation with the new party." Wise words are these, but they fell on deafs ears. The Moderates dreaming of the boon promised by Morley were in no mood to listen to the counsels of Tilak. They were more anxious to placate the Minto-Morley group by keeping the Extremists at arm's length.

Tilak, however, carried on his activities to organise the Extremists in Bombay. He established Taluk Associations all over the District of Poona, convened the first Poona District Conference, which passed the Calcutta Resolutions on Boycott and Swadeshi in spite of the opposition of the Moderates, and also another Resolution appealing for the unity of the various parties. Tilak reminded the Moderates through the columns of the *Kesari* that "it is the fear of the Extremists that has induced Government to coquette with the Moderates and not any love for the latter", and that "it was the activity of the Extremists that ultimately secured the rights and the Moderates should not therefore break away from them."

Tilak was received with wild applause at the Annual Provincial Conference of Bombay held at Dhulia and it passed a Resolution demanding full autonomous status for India, a Moderate amendment being lost with only three votes supporting it. The Moderate Press was furious, and one paper characterised the resolution as working of the anarchists "who can never be

'eceived into its fold by the Congress.'' Tilak made whirlwind :ampaign and exhorted the people to work for Swaraj and be-'eady for suffering. ''At every meeting, at every function, that ıe attended, he gave the slogan; Swaraj is my birthright ; I will ıave it.''[33]

Footnotes, Chapter III

1. Mukherjees, 173-4.
1a. Ram Gopal, *Lokamanya Tilak, A Biography*, pp. 256-259.
1b. These have been published in the form of a booklet entitled *''The Doctrine of Passive Resistance''* (Arya Publishing House, 1948).
2. Ibid, 35 ff. Arabinda also develops the idea that self-development is supplementary and necessary to the scheme propounded above, and points out that the boycott of foreign goods, Government schools, law-courts and Executive administration necessarily implies *Swadeshi*, national education, arbitration, and league of mutual defence.
3. It was separately published as a pamphlet.
4. *MR*, I. 388.
5. *Gokhale's Speeches*, 1148.
6. *MR*, I. 391.
7. *MR*, VI 187.
8. *Gokhale' Speeches*, 1148.
9. *MR*, I. 389.
10. Ibid, 406-7.
10a. The great Moderate leader, Surendra Nath Banerji, observes : ''To change one's opinions in the light of new conditions is neither a crime nor a sin. Consistency is not always a virtue. It may sometimes mean persistency in error; and a progressive mind must from time to time reconsider old ideas in the light of altered circumstances'' (*Nation*, p. 312).
11. Ibid, 98.
12. Speech delivered on 19 January, 1908, at the Bombay National Institution. Part of it has been quoted above, in Vol. I (second Edition, 1971,) pp. 385-6.
13. Speech delivered at the Conference at Jhalakathi Barisal, at the end of June, 1909.
14. This spirit is reflected in the Bengali song, beginning with the words ''Round whose mother's neck'', quoted above, on p. 151.
15. *MR*, I, 287-8.
16. See f. n., 13.
17. ''An Open Letter to my Countrymen.''
18. Morley, *On Compromise*, pp. 94 ff.

19. Quoted in *MR*, IV 263.
20. *MR*, I. 77.
21. *MR*, I. 507-9.
22. *MR*, II. 178.
23. Cf. Vol. I, pp. 407-09.
24. *MR*, VI. 476-80.
25. *MR*. VIII. pp. 458 ff.
25a. Vol. III., p. 622.
25b. Ram Gopal, op. cit., pp. 253-4.
26. Mukherjees, 139.
27. Ibid, 180-81.
28. See pp. 188-90.
29. For the account of the Surat Session, cf. Ram Gopal, op. cit., pp. 265-78; B. B. Majumdar, *Indian Political Associations and Reform of Legislature* (1818-1917), pp. 210-217.
30. Countess of Minto, pp. 99-100.
31. Ibid, pp. 108-9.
32. Ibid, pp. 161-62.
33. For Tilak's statements and activities, cf. Ram Gopal, op. cit., pp. 279-83.

CHAPTER IV

MUSLIM POLITICS

I. MUSLIM ATTITUDE TOWARDS PARTITION OF BENGAL.

The scheme for the 'Partition of Bengal' was at first opposed by the Muslims along with the Hindus. But Lord Curzon's visit to East Bengal brought about a change in the Muslim feeling. He spared no pains to convince the Muslims that they would derive great benefits from the Partition and completely won over to his side Nawab Salimullah of Dacca, who was the most influential Muslim leader in East Bengal. When the Province of East Bengal and Assam was created, the Muslims in general gradually grew enthusiastic over it. They found in the new Province, with a majority of Muslim population, a source of strength and a centre of their political activity. The Aligarh Movement had emphasized the position of the Muslims as a distinct political unit—a separate nation—in the body-politic of India. But this unit had no home of its own, except the Panjab, which was hitherto the only Province in British India with a majority of Muslim population. The addition of the rich and fertile Province of Eastern Bengal and Assam as a second unit of Muslim majority was naturally very welcome to the Muslims. It 'favourably reacted upon their sentiments throughout India and quickened their political consciousness. It is a fact that even those Muslim politicians who were not averse to the Congress were strongly in support of the Partition. In a meeting of the Muslim leaders of India, held at Dacca on 30 December, 1906, a resolution was passed upholding the 'Partition of Bengal' as beneficial to the community and deprecating agitation both against it and the Boycott movement.[1] The Central Committee of the Muslim League, which was founded in the meeting at Dacca, passed a resolution in 1908 expressing grave anxiety over the Hindu movement against the Partition and the hope that the Government would stand firm

in respect of the Partition which had brought salvation to the Musalmans of Eastern Bengal. In the annual session of the Muslim League held at Amritsar in December, 1908, it expressed vehement opposition to all "mischievous efforts" to unsettle the settled fact of the Partition of Bengal.[2] Reference may be made in this connection to the meeting of the Imperial Council in 1910 in which Mr. Bhupendra Nath Basu proposed to raise the question of reversing the Partition of Bengal. Both Shams-ul-Huda of Bengal and Mazhar-ul-Huq from Bihar strongly denounced the proposal. The latter said he wished Mr. Basu had brought up the question of Partition as a resolution, and then "the voting would have shown what India thought". The British public, he said, had heard only one side, "but the time was coming when they would hear the other side with no uncertain voice. If the Government meddled with this 'beneficent measure', it would be committing an act of supreme folly and would create unrest and discontent where none existed now."[3]

The great nationalist leader Muhammad Ali, in his speech as Congress President in 1923, referred to the reversal of the Partition of Bengal as an important cause for the alienation of the Muslims from the British Government.

II. MUSLIM DEPUTATION TO LORD MINTO

The Aligarh Movement continued to be a very active force in Muslim politics even after the death of Sir Syed Ahmad, and its leadership had passed to Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk. He soon found an extensive scope for practical demonstration of the spirit behind the Aligarh Movement.

In 1906, Morley announced in the House of Commons that the Viceroy, Lord Minto, was about to appoint a small committee to consider the question of extending the representative element in the Legislative Council. This naturally opened before the Muslims the possibility of negotiating, in advance, with the Government in order to safeguard their rights and interests in the new legislation. Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk made arrangement to wait upon the Viceroy in a deputation at Simla. The deputation, which consisted of 36 members with Aga Khan as their

leader, was received by Lord Minto on October 1, 1906. As the prayer of the deputation and the reply of Lord Minto thereto constitute the first definite enunciation of the new policy of the Government in respect of the Muslims and also form the foundation of all subsequent developments in Muslim politics, it is necessary to discuss this question at some length. The deputation presented an address the trend of which may be easily gathered from the following extract :

"The Mahomedans of India according to the latest census number over sixty-two millions or between one-fifth and one-fourth of the total population of His Majesty's Indian dominons. We, therefore, desire to submit that under any system of representation, extended or limited, a community in itself more numerous than the entire population of any first class European power, except Russia, may justly lay claim to adequate recognition as an important factor in the State.

"We venture, indeed, with your Fxcellency's permission, to go a step further, and urge that the position accorded to the Mahomedan community, in any kind of representation, direct or indirect, and in all other ways affecting their status and influence, should be commensurate, not merely with their numerical strength but also with their political importance and the value of the contribution which they make to the defence of the empire, and we also hope that your Excellency will in this connection be pleased to give due consideration to the position which they occupied in India a little more than hundred years ago and of which the traditions have naturally not faded from their minds....

"We hope your Excellency will pardon our stating at the outset that representative institutions of the European type are new to the Indian people ; many of the most thoughtful members of our community in fact consider that the greatest care, forethought, and caution will be necessary if they are to be successfully adapted to the social, religious and political conditions obtaining in India, and that in the absence of such care and caution their adoption is likely, among other evils, to place our national interest at the mercy of an unsympathetic majority.....

"It is most unlikely that the name of any Mahomedan candidate will ever be submitted for the approval of Government by the electoral bodies as now constituted unless he is in

sympathy with the majority in all matters of importance. Nor can we in fairness find fault with the desire of our non-Muslim fellow-subjects to take full advantage of their strength and vote only for members of their own community, or for persons, if not Hindus, who are expected to vote with the Hindu majority on whose goodwill they would have to depend for their future re-election."

The address of the deputation outlined an elaborate scheme for Muslim representation, beginning with the Municipal and District Boards and going right up to the Imperial Legislative Council. The deputation urged that "(a) in the cadre of the Council the proportion of Mohammedan representatives should not be determined on the basis of numerical strength of the community, and that in any case the Mohammedan representatives should never be in an ineffective minority; (b) as far as possible, appointments by election siould be given preference over nomination; (c) for purposes of choosing Mohammedan members, Mohammedan landowners, lawyers, merchants and representatives of other important interests, of status to be subsequently determined by your Excellency's Government, Mohammedan members of the Provincial Councils and Mohammedan Fellows of Universities should be invested with electoral prowers to be exercised in accordance with such procedure as may be prescribed by your Excellency's Government in that behalf."

The address demanded among other things, (1) employment of a due proportion of Mohammedans in Government service; (2) abolition of competitive examinations for recruitment to the services; (3) appointment of Muslim judges in every High Court and Chief Court; (4) communal electorate for municipalities and (5) Muslim electoral colleges for election to Legislative Councils. The Deputation also asked for the protection of Muslim interests in case an Indian Executive Councillor was appointed, and help in founding a Muslim University.

In reply, after some preliminary observations of a general nature, Lord Minto said: "You need not ask my pardon for telling me that "representative institutions of the European type are entirely new to the people of India", or that their introduction here requires the most earnest thought and care. I should

be very far from welcoming all the political machinery of the Western world among the hereditary traditions and instincts of Eastern races.....

"The pith of your address, as I understand it, is a claim that, in any system of representation, whether it affects a Municipality, District Board, or a Legislative Council, in which it is proposed to introduce or increase the electoral organization, the Mohammedan community should be represented as a community. You point out that in many cases electoral bodies, as now constituted, cannot be expected to return a Mohammedan candidate, and that if by chance they did so, it could only be at the sacrifice of such a candidate's views to those of a majority opposed to his own community, whom he would in no way represent, and you justly claim that your position should be estimated not merely on your numerical strength but in respect to the political importance of your community and the service it has rendered to the Empire.

"I am entirely in accord with you. Please do not misunderstand me : I make no attempt to indicate by what means the representation of communities can be obtained, but I am as firmly convinced as I believe you to be, that any electoral representation in India would be doomed to mischievous failure which aimed at granting a personal enfranchisement regardless of the beliefs and traditions of the communities composing the population of this continent. The great mass of the people of India have no knowledge of representative institutions.

"I agree with you, gentlemen, that the initial rungs in the ladder of self-government are to be found in the Municipal and District Boards.

"In the meantime I can only say to you that the Mahommedan community may rest assured that their political rights and interests as a community wiil be safeguarded by any administrative re-organization with which I am concerned, and that you, and the people of India, may rely on the British Raj to respect, as it has been its pride to do, the religious beliefs and the national traditions of the myriads composing the population of His Majesty's Indian Empire."[4]

This reply heralded a new policy of British rule in India. In the first place, it gave the official seal of approval to the

principle that Hindus and Muslims constituted practically two separate nations with different interests and different outlook. In the second place, the Government practically promised to show undue favour to the Muslims in respect of their number of representatives in the Legislative Council by making it far in excess of their numerical ratio to the whole population. These two points formed the chief planks in the Muslim politics ever since and it may be said without much exaggeration that they formed the foundation on which Pakistan was built about forty years later. In view of all this, it is necessary to go into this question somewhat more critically than was done by the contemporaries. It must be admitted in fairness that several facts have come to light which were not known to the contemporaries, who could not therefore form a proper judgment of the whole thing.

It is now definitely known that the whole of this deputation was engineered by the Government, or at least by Englishmen under official inspiration. This is proved by the detailed statement of Maulvi Sayyid Tufail Ahmad Mangalori, showing how the matter was settled at Simla between Mr. Archbold, the Principal of the Aligarh College, and Dunlop Smith, the Private Secretary of the Viceroy. Mr. Archbold had a talk with the Private Secretary of the Viceroy about a proposed deputation. The letter which Mr. Archbold wrote on the 10th August, 1906, after the talk, to the late Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk was printed and distributed to the members of the deputation. It appears from a summary of this letter, which is given below, how the Principals of the Aligarh College used to guide the details of the political policy of the Musalmans and how they occupied the position of a Resident of the Government at Aligarh. Every word of this summary deserves careful study :

"Colonel Dunlop Smith (Private Secretary to the Viceroy) now writes to me that the Viceroy is prepared to receive the deputation of Musalmans and intimates me that a formal petition be submitted for it. In this connection the following matters require consideration.

"The first question is that of sending the petition. To my mind it would be enough that some leaders of Musalmans, even though they may not have been elected, should put their

signatures to it. The second is the question as to who the members of the deputation should be. They should be representatives of all the provinces. The third question is of the contents of the address. In this connection my opinion is that in the address loyalty should be expressed, that thanks should be offered that in accordance with the settled policy steps are going to be taken in the direction of self-government according to which the door will be opened for Indians to offices. But apprehension should be expressed that by introducing election injury will be done to Musalman minority and hope should be expressed that in introducing the system of nomination or granting representation on religious basis the opinion of Musalmans will be given due weight. The opinion should also be given that in a country like India it is necessary that weight should be attached to the views of zamindars.

"My personal opinion is that the wisest thing for Musalmans to do would be that they support the system of nomination because the time for introducing election has not yet come. Besides it will be very difficult for them, if the system of election is introduced, to secure their proper share.

"But in all these matters I want to remain behind the screen and this move should come from you. You are aware how anxious I am for the good of the Musalmans and I would, therefore, render all help with the greatest pleasure. I can prepare and draft the address for you. If it be prepared in Bombay then I can revise it because I know the art of drawing up petitions in good language.' But Nawabsaheb, please remember that if within a short time any great and effective action has to be taken then you should act quickly."[6]

It may be added that long after this event, Muhammad Ali, who was at that time a devout follower of Syed Ahmad, pronounced the whole deputation to be a "command performance"[7], and even Lady Minto in her diary actually used the word "engineered" in connection with the Muhammadan deputation. The fact that it was engineered by the officialdom and that they were under no illusion as to the inevitable consequences of this measure upon the subsequent relations between the Hindus and the Muslims would appear from the following entry in the diary of Lady Minto, under date, October 1, 1906 :

"This evening I have received the following letter from an Official: "I must send Your Excellency a line to say that a very, very big thing has happened to-day. A work of statesmanship that will affect India and Indian history for many a long year. It is nothing less than the pulling back of sixty-two millions of people from joining the ranks of the seditious opposition."[8] The same view is expressed by Buchan, the biographer of Minto, who observes, significantly enough, that Minto's reply to the Muslim Deputation "undoubtedly prevented the ranks of sedition being swollen by Moslem recruits, an inestimable advantage in the day of trouble which was dawning."[9]

Long afterwards Ramsay Macdonald, the future Prime Minister of Britain, wrote in the same strain: "The Mohammedan leaders are inspired by certain Anglo-Indian officials, and that these officials have pulled wires at Simla and in London and of malice aforethought sowed discord between the Hindu and the Mchammedan communities by showing the Muslims special favours."[10]

It seldom falls to the lot of historians to get such unimpeachable evidence of a great sinister move which otherwise would have never been admitted by the authorities. This one incident shows how eager the Government was to wean away the Muslims from joining the political struggle which the Hindus were waging against the British. It does not require any ingenuity to conclude that it was as a great counterpoise to Congress influence that Minto welcomed the Muslim deputation which must have been engineered by his officials and other non-official Englishmen, unless he hit upon the idea himself. At last Minto found a solution to the vexed problem of reducing the importance of the Congress which had been troubling his mind ever since his arrival in India.

The conspiracy between the British and the Muslims which engineered the Muslim Deputation to Lord Minto was not confined to India. Tufail Ahmad writes that things had been so arranged that the deputation should receive a good press in England. And so in fact it turned out to be. The British press was agog with joy that the myth of one Indian nation was exploded. The Congress and Bengal agitators were ridiculed for holding this view, and the Muslims were praised for pricking the

bubble. On the very day the Simla drama was enacted, the London *Times* devoted a few columns to a study of the Indian problem, and reiterated Beck's theory that India was not suitable for democratic institutions. Next day, on October 2, the *Times* drew a comparison between Bengal agitation and Muslim statesmanship. Another paper abused the Hindus and the Congress, and praised the Muslims as a brave nation.

"It appears from these articles how the English press looked upon Indians being one nation with a sense of shock and heart-burning, and how pleased they were to see it broken into pieces and how proud they felt in setting the Indians against one another on the basis of religion and of creating lasting hostility between them."[11]

Very much the same view was taken at Whitehall, as would be evident from Morley's letter dated 26 October, 1906 ;

"All that you tell me of your Mohammedans is full of interest, and I only regret, that I could not have moved about unseen at your garden party. The whole thing has been as good as it could be, and it stamps your position and personal authority decisively. Among other good effects of your deliverance is this, that it has completely deranged the plans and tactics of the critical faction here, that is to say it has prevented them from any longer representing the Indian Government as the ordinary case of bureaucracy versus the people. I hope that even my stoutest Radical friends will now see that the problem is not quite so simple as this."[11a] When 'honest' John, the biographer of Gladstone and the idol of the Moderate Party in India, approved of Minto's action and could not suppress his glee at the possibility of the Hindu-Muslim split, it is hardly necessary to add that the Englishmen in general hailed the deputation with delight, and regarded it as a master stroke of diplomacy or statesmanship on the part of Minto. Buchan, whose opinion has been quoted above, describes Minto's reply as a 'Charter of Islamic rights.'

In August, 1893, the Central National Muslims' Association, representing leading Muhammadans of Bengal and other States, submitted a memorial to the Government, drawing the Government's attention to the necessity for the due representation of Muhammadans in the Viceroy's Legislative Council. They had, in a spirit of loyalty, suggested suitable protection of Muslim

interests because they feared they had no chance to be selected. The Government of India, in reply to the memorialists, had indicated a sympathetic attitude.[12]

The stage had thus been already set. But it was reserved for Minto to give the official seal of approval to the policy of Divide and Rule and setting the Muslims against the Hindus, which two successive Secretaries of State—Lord Cross and Lord Hamilton—regarded, since the birth of the Indian National Congress, as a consummation devoutly to be wished for.

III. FOUNDATION OF THE MUSLIM LEAGUE

The Muslims were naturally elated with the favourable reception that the Government accorded to their deputation. As noted above, the Partition of Bengal and the events that followed also filled them with a new zeal and quickened their political consciousness. They now felt the need of a political association. As yet there was no central political organization of the Muslims as a whole, though, as noted above, there were local associations in different parts of India. This was mainly due to the fact that Syed Ahmad himself discouraged the idea of such organizations, and regarded them as unnecessary, as he had implicit faith in the justice of the British Government. His European friends also supported this view, as they were afraid that if the Muslims were politically organized, they might follow in the footsteps of the Hindus in ultimately turning against Government. The Muslims, therefore, did not bestir themselves for any central political organization. Their position may be likened to that of the Irish accused, who, when questioned by the Judge about his counsel, promptly replied : "Sir, I have not engaged any defence counsel, for I have got friends in the jury." Unfortunately, the friendliness of the juriy could not always be relied upon. The first rift in the lute was caused by the Hindi-Urdu controversy. It was the practice in U.P. that all petitions to the court must be written in Urdu. The Hindus having protested against it, the Government passed an order on 8 April, 1900, to the effect that the Government offices and lawcourts should also entertain petitions written in Hindi and Devanagari script, and that court summons and official announcements would be issued in future

in both Urdu and Hindi. The Muslims resented the order on the ground that it lowered the status and prestige of Urdu, and held protest meetings in different parts of the Province. The Hindus also held meetings supporting the Government order, and this controversy continued for months, worsening the Hindu-Muslim relations to a considerable degree.

The Aligarh politics was also naturally affected. Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk, who presided over a protest meeting at Lakhnau, demanding the withdrawal of the order, used such unrestrained language that the Lieutenant-Governor asked him either to resign his Secretaryship of the Aligarh College, or to give up his connection with the Anjuman-e-Urdu, a body mainly responsible for carrying on the vigorous agitation against the Government order. The Nawab accepted the latter alternative, but a few leaders in Aligarh took exception to the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor and mooted the idea of starting a political organization. Mohsin-ul-Mulk himself opposed the idea as it violated the directive of Syed Ahmad, and Morrison, the Principal of the College, condemned the move, as it would mean 'going the Congress way'. Morrison's attitude scotched the proposal for the time being, though some time later Waqar-ul-Mulk succeeded in forming a Muhammadan political organization. But in spite of his earnest efforts he could not infuse any strength in it and it became defunct after a precarious existence of five years.[13]

The situation was, however, completely changed, first by the Partition of Bengal, and next by the announcement of coming constitutional reforms. The anti-Partition agitation among the Hindus was mounting high and the Congress championed their cause. It occurred to the Muhammadans that in order to counteract the political organization of the Hindus, particularly the Congress, they should have a central organization of their own; specially, in view of the ensuing reforms in the constitution of the Councils, such an organization had become necessary to safeguard the Muslim interests. This and several other reasons combined to hasten the foundation of the Muslim League. Taking advantage of the presence of a large number of eminent Muslim leaders at Dacca in connection with the Muhammadan Educational Conference, Nawab Salimullah of Dacca arranged a

meeting to consider this question. He proposed a scheme of a Central Muhammadan Association to look after the exclusive interests of the Muslim community. He pointed out that such a central association would do away with the confusion arising from a number of local Muslim associations, some of which were run by selfish and interested persons. He made it very clear that the two chief aims of the proposed association were to support the British Government and to look after the rights and interests of the Musalmans as a whole. He also made no secret that one of its objects would be to check the growing influence of the Congress and to provide scope for the participation of Muslim youths in politics, thereby preventing them from joining the Indian National Congress. The scheme was accepted and, at a meeting held on December 30, 1906, immediately after the conclusion of the session of Muhammadan Educational Conference, it was resolved that a political association called "All-India Muslim League" should be established. A committee was appointed to frame a draft constitution of the League and Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk and Nawab Waqar-ul-Mulk, who presided over the meeting, were appointed Joint Secretaries of the Committee. The Committee framed the rules and regulations which were accepted at a meeting held at Karachi on December 29, 1907.

The aims and objects of the League were laid down as follows :—

(a) To promote, amongst the Musalmans of India, feelings of loyalty towards the British Government, and to remove any misconception that may arise as to the intentions of Government with regard to any of its measures.

(b) To protect and advance the political and other rights of the Mussalmans of India and respectfully represent their needs and aspirations to the Government.

(c) To prevent the rise among the Musalmans of India of any feeling of hostility towards other communities, without prejudice to the other aforesaid objects of the League.[14]

The prevailing feeling of the Muslims regarding the aims and objects of the League would be evident from a frank confession made by Zaka Ullah that there was nothing in common in the aims of the two organizations—the Muslim League and the Indian National Congress—and he cited concrete instances to

prove his contention. The Secretary of the League himself declared:

"We are not opposed to the social unity of the Hindus and the Mussalmans.....But the other type of unity (political) involves the working out of common political purposes. This sort of our unity with the Congress cannot be possible because we and the Congressmen do not have common political objectives. They indulge in acts calculated to weaken the British Government. They want representative Government which means death for Mussalmans. They desire competitive examinations for employment in Government services and this would mean the deprivation of Mussalmans of Government jobs. Therefore, we need not go near political unity (with the Hindus). It is the aim of the League to present Muslim demands through respectful request, before the Government. They should not, like Congressmen, cry for boycott, deliver exciting speeches and write impertinent articles in newspapers and hold meetings to turn public feeling and attitude against their benign Government."[15]

Further light is thrown on the political ideals of the League by a speech which Nawab Waqar-ul-Mulk delivered about three months after the Dacca meeting in a students' gathering at Aligarh. He said: "God forbid, if the British rule disappears from India, Hindus will lord over it; and we will be in constant danger of our life, property and honour. The only way for the Muslims to escape this danger is to help in the continuance of the British rule. If the Muslims are heartily with the British, then that rule is bound to endure. Let the Muslims consider themselves as a British Army ready to shed their blood and sacrifice their lives for the British Crown." Then, referring to the Congress, he said: "We are not to emulate the agitational politics of the Congress. If we have any demands to make, they must be submitted to Government with due respect. But remember that it is your national duty to be loyal to the British rule. Wherever you are, whether in football field or in the tennis lawn, you have to consider yourselves as soldiers of a British regiment. You have to defend the British Empire, and to give the enemy a fight in doing so. If you bear it in mind and act accordingly, you will have done that and your name will be

written in letters of gold in the British Indian history. The future generations will be grateful to you."[16]

The Muslim opposition to the Hindus was not confined to their political activities. Such opposition to certain Hindu activities like anti-cow-killing propaganda or even the Hindi-Urdu controversy is easy to understand, though it would be historically inaccurate to say that they were at the root of Hindu-Muslim differences. For these differences, as we have seen, were due to far deeper causes. But the Muslim opposition to Shivaji-festival stands on a different footing. It was due to the fact that Muslims were not prepared to accept Hindu heroes as the national heroes of the country. Zaka Ullah stated tauntingly: "The followers of Congress have Bande Mataram on their tongue, but they have nothing of the sort in their heart.....For practical action another Shivaji, whose birth in the present age is impossible, is required to assist Tilak and Gokhale." Wilayat Ali rightly expressed the Muhammadan attitude towards *Swadeshi* in these words: "For some time past there has prevailed a disposition in some Muhammadan quarters to think that every movement of Hindu origin has the inevitable tendency to be detrimental to their (the Muslim) interest, and that it would be suicidal to suffer any movement to go unopposed.....To me nothing is more indicative of the strained relation between the two communities than the unreasoning opposition with which the *Swadeshi* movement is hailed by the Mohamedans." This was, indeed, the Muslim attitude so far as all Hindu activities were concerned.

The militant attitude of the Muslim leaders deserves special notice. Nawab Mohsin-ul-Mulk went to the length of saying, in course of the Hindi-Urdu controversy: "Although we have not the might of pen.....but our hands are still strong enough to wield the might of sword."

IV. HINDU-MUSLIM RELATIONS

The foundation of the Muslim League and Minto's concessions had the effect of dividing the Hindus and Muslims into almost two hostile political camps. A remarkable example is afforded by a letter written about 1908 A. D. by Mr. Ziauddin

Ahmad, later Vice-Chancellor of the Muslim University, Aligarh, to Mr. Abdulla Shurawardy, both of whom were then prosecuting their studies in Europe. Abdulla Shuhrawardy shared the national feeling which then characterized Indian students in Europe, and for this he was rebuked by Ziauddin in a letter from which we quote the following extract:—

"You know that we have a definite political policy at Aligarh, i.e. the policy of Sir Syed. I understand that Mr. Kirshna Varma has founded a society called 'Indian Home Rule Society' and you are also one of its vice-presidents. Do you really believe that the Mohammedans will be profited if Home Rule be granted to India ?.....There is no doubt that this Home Rule is decidedly against the Aligarh policy.....what I call the Aligarh policy is really the policy of all the Mohammedans generally—of the Mohammedans of Upper India particularly." Mr. Asaf Ali wrote to Pandit Shyamji in September, 1909: "I am staying with some Muslim friends who do not like me to associate with nationalists ; and to save many unpleasant consequences I do not want to irritate them unnecessarily.[17] Thus the Muslim antagonism to the Freedom Movement of India dates back to its beginning itself.

Even Muhammad Ali, who posed as a staunch nationalist and a great admirer of Gandhi, and in whose sincerity Gandhi had absolute confidence, belonged to the anti-Hindu group. In support of this, reference may be made to the speech of Muhammad Ali as President of the Muslim League Session in 1908, in which he not only accepted the standpoint of Sir Syed Ahmad that the Muslims in India must stand by themselves but ridiculed the idea of Hindu-Muslim unity, as the following extract from his speech will show :

"At any rate the Muslims canot be expected to take poisonous cup and drink it to the dregs without a murmur as a martyr to the unity of India.....The sanctimonious apostles of unity contend that the interests of Mohammadans do not differ from those of Hindus. They were the same when Shivaji revolted against Aurangzeb, or when the situation described in the Anand Math existed. The interests in that sense of the whole of humanity are the same.....The position of different societies in the scale of political evolution is judged according to

the degree to which each has eliminated the personal from the principles that guide it in its system of Government. It is therefore a retrogade step in our political evolution to leave us at the mercy of an angelic majority that invariably thinks of the unity of India's ultimate interests."

It is of interest to note that this is quoted with approval by a distinguished Muslim leader, Mohammad Noman, in his book, *Muslim India,* published in 1942. There is hardly any doubt that from the days of of Sir Syed Ahmed down to the year 1947 the Muslim leaders, with a few exceptions here and there, definitely clung to the view that the interests of the Muslims differed from those of the Hindus and would suffer if they joined with the Hindus in their political agitation. The ghost of Syed Ahmad dominated the Muslim community in spite of occasional opposition by individual Muslms. They were all Muslim first and Indian afterwards.

It is hardly surprising that the Englishmen would try by every means to keep up the differences between the two communities. Sir Bamfylde Fuller, Lieutenant-Governor of East Bengal and Assam, admitted his preferential treatment of the Muslims and explained it by a parable. "I said," writes he, "that I was like a man who was married to two wives, one a Hindu, the other a Muhammadan—both young and charming—but was forced into the arms of one of them by the rudeness of the other.[18] Anyone who goes through Chapter IX of Chirol's *Indian Unrest,* published in 1910, will realize to what extent the anti-Hindu doctrines of Syed Ahmad had thoroughly impregnated the Muslim community, and also how the sympathies, openly expressed by the imperialist Englishmen of his type to the most unfounded charges brought by the Muslims against the Hindus, were calculated to widen the cleavage between the two communities. Some of these were "outrageous attacks upon the Mahamedan's religion both in the press and on the platform by the Arya Samajists", "commercial and social boycott, none the less oppressive and damaging because it is not openly proclaimed." There is a belief, says Chirol, amongst the Muhammadans that the Hindu community is compassing deep-laid schemes for the promotion of its own ultimate ascendancy. Special significance attaches to his concluding remark : "It would be an

evil day if the Muhammadans came to believe that they could only trust to their own right hand, and no longer to the authority and sense of justice of the British Raj, to avert the dangers which they foresee in the future from the establishment of an overt or covert Hindu ascendancy." ...

Sir Percival Griffiths observes: "Whatever may have been other effects of the foundation of the Muslim League, it set the seal upon the Muslim belief that their interests must be regarded as completely separate from those of the Hindus, and that no fusion of the two communities was possible." He added: "The philosopher might deplore the fact that Hindus and Muslims thought of themselves as separate people, but the statesman had to accept it."[19] He is quite right, only he does not stop to discuss how far the 'statesmen' referred to by him were mainly responsible for the deplorable fact.

Mr. William Samuel Lilly, another member of the Indian Civil Service, writes in his book, *India and Its Problems*: "It appears to me that we should sedulously seek for those among them most fitted socially, morally and intellectually to rule, and associate them with Englishmen freely and liberally, even in the highest offices—such are the Muhammadans of Northern India —one of the noblest races in the country."[20]

In striking and refreshing contrast is the following assessment of the situation by a Frenchman, M. Ernest Piriou, Professor in the University of Paris.

"Who had foreseen that Indian nationalism would give birth to a Musalman nationalism, first sulky, then hostile and aggressive? Questions of race? not at all; for the Parsis, though wealthy, are in the front rank of the apostles of Indian demands. Some rancours and mistrusts of old, no doubt, but with new susceptibilities, and more than all, a divergence of momentary and partial interests are widening a difference which a clearer sense of common and lasting interests shall, I am sure, bridge over. At any rate the most dangerous enemies of Indian politics are the Musalmans. And they have not stopped midway, they have thrown themselves into the arms of the English so warmly opened to receive them. These irreconcileable enemies of the day before, artificers and victims of the revolution of 1857, are now the bodyguards of the Viceroy.

"The Indians when they become very troublesome are shown the sword of the Musalman hanging over their heads. The menace even is not necessary. When the Indians, strong in the opinion of the nation, demand simultaneous examinations in London and in India, it is so easy to tell them with curled lips "First begin by coming to an understanding amongst yourselves, and by converting the Musalman." The Musalman opposition is a marvellous resource. The English, I beg of you to believe it, know how to draw fine effects out of it.

"If ever this misunderstanding, so skilfully nourished, happens to clear up, the English would be the most disconsolate. For this Islamic block is a force, and on this block, this solid *point d' appui,* revolves Anglo-Indian policy."[21]

The Partition of Bengal and the foundation of the Muslim League widened the cleavage between the Hindus and the Muslims. The passionate outburst against the Partition which was noticed not only all over Bengal, but more or less all over India, was in striking contrast to the delight with which the Muslim League welcomed the measure. It undoubtedly gave great offence to the Hindus to see that the way in which Government practically disregarded the wishes of the entire Bengali community found support in a section of the population. The Partition was not merely an administrative measure ; it was a deliberate outrage upon public sentiment. But even more than this, it brought to the forefront a great political issue, namely, whether India was to be governed autocratically without any regard to the sentiments and opinions of the people, or on the enlightened principles professed by the British rulers. Looked at from this point of view, the Partition invited a trial of strength between the people and the bureaucracy. It was a momentous issue far transcending the mere wishes and opinions or even the interests of one community or another. It was a national issue of vital importance and the attitude of the Muslims naturally constituted one of the greatest shocks to the national sentiments in India.

Then there was also the question of weightage and separate electorate. However much the Muslims might defend or justify the demand for separate electorate, National India could not but feel that it cut at the very root of the idea of an Indian Nation.

Throughout the two years 1907 and 1908, there was an acrimonious discussion regarding the separate electorate and the weightage proposed by the Muslim Deputation and consented to by Lord Minto. The question was discussed *ad nauseam* in the different journals and the numerous public meetings which were held all over the country. As regards the separate electorate, the Muslim argument centred round the essential differences between the Hindus and the Muslims, as they held that owing to the great differences in religion, social customs, and historical traditions, their interests were entirely different from those of the Hindus. The Muslim minority therefore feared that it would not be dealt with fairly by the Hindu majority. The Muslims, in fact, said in so many words that they could not safely trust Hindus with what they conceived to be the real and proper interest of the community. This was tantamount to what afterwards came to be known as the two-nation theory. Besides, the Muslims believed hat the Hindus would not vote for a Muslim candidate as against a Hindu of even inferior merit, and would support only those Muslim candidates who would be ready to placate the Hindus even at the cost of sacrificing the true interest of their own community. On the other hand, the opposite school, mostly consisting of Hindus, refused to accept the Muslim contention by pointing out actual instances of Municipal and District Board elections where the Muslims were returned in even larger number than was warranted by their numerical strength. Muslim leaders with national outlook openly asked their co-religonists : "Has the Congress pressed for any rights which would have specially benefitted the Hindus at the expense of, the Muhammadans" ? "Can you point out a single instance where the Indian National Congress has done anything injurious to the interests of the Muslims ?" The number of such nationalist Muslim leaders, however, was very few indeed.

But although the Hindus could not agree to the arguments of the Muslims on the subject of separate electorate, there was at least some logic in them. There was, however, very little of it in the arguments by which the Muslims supported the other concession, namely, that they should be given a greater representation in the different Councils than is warranted by their

numerical strength in the whole population of India. The two arguments, which were pressed by the Deputation and were later repeated by the Muslim disputants all over the country, were the political importance of the Muslims and the part they took in the defence of India. It is very difficult to understand the import of any of these arguments. As regards the political importance, it was pointed out by the Muslims that they had ruled India for 700 years before the British came. Apart from the fact that this is not quite accurate, because just on the eve of the British rule, the Hindu Marathas and the Sikhs wielded far greater political authority than the Muslims, the Hindus could very well point out in reply that if the Muslims ruled for 700 years before the British, the Hindus ruled at least for 2500 years before the Muslims, and there were many principalities ruled by the Hindus throughout the Muslim period. Further, it is to be pointed out that even about half a century before Lord Minto recognized the political importance of the Muslims, the British rulers held an entirely different view about them, and far from admitting any claims of the Muhammadans for favour in that respect, the Government definitely held that the Muslims were their greatest enemies and treated them accordingly. It is an interesting sight how, almost overnight the Muslims were transformed into an important element in favour with the British from a frankly hostile group—a position which was held by them, on very good grounds, in the eyes of the British rulers of an earlier generation. The expression 'political importance' has got another connotation, namely, the part played in the development of political consciousness of the country, which alone should form a basis of rightful claim' for demanding political rights. Looked at from this point of view, the claims of the Hindus were undoubtedly far greater than those of the Muslims, as the latter had done really very little by way of positive contribution to the national development, and did their very best to check the progress of any efforts made by the Hindus in that direction. But the Hindus did not claim any additional advantage on the ground of such political importance.

The Muslim deputation to Minto stressed the part played by the Muslims in defending the country. It is a curious

claim in view of the fact that the country was defended by paid soldiers forming part of a regular army, and no particular community can base any special claim for concession on that ground. For the composition of the army depended upon the sweet will of the Government and could be varied from time to time according to the needs and exigencies of circumstances. But even taking the question in the sense intended by the Muslims, namely, the number of Muslims in the Indian army, it should be pointed out that they could hardly claim any special importance in view of the fact that the Gurkhas, the Rajputs, the Sikhs, and the Marathas played no less important part, not to put it more bluntly, than the Baluchis, the Pathans and other Muslim regiments of Indian army. It is also to be noted that these Muslim tribes had hardly developed any political consciousness as yet. It is amusing indeed that the civilian political leaders would put forward claims to improve their political status by invoking the military service of bands of paid soldiers, who had little or no interest in the political question even when considered from a communal point of view.

The question in the abstract was discussed by both sides for a great length of time. This topic may be concluded by quoting the words of Montagu and Chelmsford who can by no means be regarded as unduly friendly to the Hindus. Their views carry greater weight from the fact that they felt themselves compelled to make recommendations at variance with them. Nobody lays stress on a principle which they find themselves unable to follow unless they have a deep regard for its truth.

"The crucial test to which, as we conceive, all proposals should be brought is whether they will or will not help to carry India towards responsible government. Some persons hold that for a people, such as they deem those of India to be, so divided by race, religion and caste as to be unable to consider the interests of any but their own section, a system of communal and class representation is not merely inevitable, but is actually best. They maintain that it evokes and applies the principle of democracy over the widest range over which it is actually alive at all by appealing to the instincts which are

strongest ; and that we must hope to develop the finer, which are also at present the weaker, instincts by using the forces that really count. According to this theory communal representation is an inevitable, and even a healthy, stage in the development of a non-political people.....But when we consider what responsible government implies, and how it was developed in the world, we cannot take this view.....We conclude unhesitatingly that the history of self-government among the nations who developed it, and spread it through the world, is decisively against the admission by the State of any divided allegiance ; against the State's arranging its members in any way which encourages them to think of themselves primarily as citizens of any smaller unit than itself.

"Indian lovers of their country would be the first to admit that India generally has not yet acquired the citizen spirit, and if we are really to lead her to self-government we must do all that we possibly can to call it forth in her people. Division by creeds and classes means the creation of political camps organized against each other, and teaches men to think as partisans and not as citizens ; and it is difficult to see how the change from this system to national representation is ever to occur. The British Government is often accused of dividing men in order to govern them. But if it unnecessarily divides them at the very moment when it professes to start them on the road to governing themselves, it will find it difficult to meet the charge of being hypocritical or short-sighted.

"There is another important point. A minority which is given special representation owing to its weak and backward state is positively encouraged to settle down into a feeling of satisfied security ; it is under no inducement to educate and qualify itself to make good the ground which it has lost compared with the stronger majority. On the other hand, the latter will be tempted to feel that they have done all they need do for their weaker fellow-countrymen, and that they are free to use their power for their own purposes. The give-and-take which is the essence of political life is lacking. There is no inducement to the one side to forbear, or to the other to exert itself. The communal system stereotypes existing relations.

"We regard any system of communal electorates, therefore,

as a very serious hindrance to the development of the self-governing principle."[22]

As mentioned above, the Act of 1909, and the Regulations made thereunder, embodied in substance the concessions virtually promised by Minto to the Muslims. Under these Regulations not only did they receive a separate electorate but their number of members in the Council was much greater than would be warranted by the numerical strength of their population. This set the seal of Government approval on the theory of two nations or two races, or two separate communities, with distinct interests and outlooks, which were preached by Sir Syed Ahmad and formed the basis of the Aligarh Movement. Henceforth, there was no turning back and, as years rolled by, this idea of the Muslims being a separate political entity got greater and greater momentum like a ball moving on an inclined plane. It constituted the chief problem of Indian politics and, with many vicissitudes and under strange circumstances, the problem was ultimately solved by the creation of Pakistan.

It is only fair to mention here that there were some individual Muslims who uttered a dissenting note of warning and pointed out that the separate electorate or weightage, instead of benefitting the Muslims, would rather go against their true interests, inasmuch as it will take from them that energy and initiative which would cause a strong inducement to the community as a whole to raise their status by their own efforts so as to be on equal terms with the Hindus. But these dissidents were few in number and their views did not count in the general evolution of Muslim politics. Still they deserve a brief notice.

Nawab Sadiq Ali Khan, a barrister, said at a meeting in Lakhnau, that "the principle of class and religious representation is a most mischievous feature of the scheme .....It is not good for Mohammedans to be taught that their political interests are different from those of the Hindus.....From a Mohammedan standpoint, too, in my humble opinion, that principle is fraught with mischief."[23] Two years after the Morley-Minto Reforms were enacted, Ramsay Macdonald, who later became Prime Minister of Britain,

made some disclosures in a book on India. He said: "Some of the far-seeing members of the Mohammedan community are already beginning to feel that they have made a mistake. Several spoke to me with bitterness about the way certain of their leaders had consented to play a game planned for them by Anglo-Indian officials, whilst in the minds of others who were still in favour of what had been done, a knowledge was dawning that there were dangers ahead and that they might have been better protected if they had not asked for so much."[24]

A Muhammadan gentleman wrote in the same strain that "the attempt on the part of my co-religionists 'to create an irreconcilable Ulster in India,' is not very laudable. This will veritably be the opening of Pandora's box and India will then be confronted with a grave situation of the first magnitude."[25] His words proved prophetic when the reforms of 1919 extended the principle of separate electorate to the Sikhs and some Scheduled Castes.

The position of the Hindu leaders may be summed up in the two following extracts from the speeches of G. K. Gokhale: "It was a commonplace of Indian politics that there can be no future for India as a nation unless a durable spirit of co-operation was developed and established between the two great communities." And again: "The union of all communities is no doubt the goal towards which we have to strive, but it cannot be denied that it does not exist in the country to-day, and it is no use proceeding as though it existed when in reality it does not."[26]

The Hindu leaders were thus in a great dilemma. On the one hand, they realized the need of unity, and on the other they felt that there was no immediate prospect of such unity. There were no doubt some politicians who would ignore the great differences between the two communities and talk and behave as if there was no difference beteen them and they constituted a common brotherhood. This has been the attitude not only of the politicians of older generation but, as we shall see later, it was also the basis on which even Gandhi and other political leaders of this century proceeded, while carrying on struggle against the British. But that eminently shrewd and practical statesman. Gokhale, was under no such illusion, as the second

extract, quoted above, will show. In support of his view he very frankly admitted that "over the greater part of India, the two communities had inherited a tradition of antagonism which though it might ordinarily lie dormant, broke forth into activity at the smallest provocation. It was this tradition that had to be overcome."[27] So he fully shared the desire of unity but was equally conscious of the absence of any such thing and the difficulty of achieveing it.

The Muslim community realized the dilemma in which the Hindu politicians were placed, and it is not at all surprising that they would fully utilize it in bargaining with them for the sake of establishing a united political front. Once an individual is told that his assistance is essential, it is only natural that he should put a high premium on his co-operation. The Muslims would be something more or something less than human if they would not be actuated by that spirit in putting an unduly high price on the political co-operation with the Hindus which the latter believed to be essential for the further progress of India. It is only fair to add that there were a few individuals, here and there, who realized the incongruity and inconsistency in the attitude of the Hindu leaders, and its almost inevitable consequence,—namely the growing intransigence of the Muslims. They publicly declared that while the Muslim help would be of great advantage to the national struggle, it was not an essential element for success. But such voices were very rare. One insance may be offered as specimen:

"Is there any hope for Nationalism in the event of a misunderstanding between Hindu and Musalman ? Of course there is ! We should like to work together. There is no question as to the greater strength of the rope that is made of double strands; but this is a moral strength and clearness, only. In face of the immense numerical preponderance enjoyed by one of the parties, it would be quite clear, even if the history of the past had not already elucidated it, that mutual co-operation of the two great sections of the Indian nation is only an advantage, not a necessity to nationalism. Hindus are in no way inferior in prowess. The bravest race in India is Hindu, not Mohammedan. We have the advantage in education. It is for he sake of Mohammedans themselves that we desire that nationality should

be a common cause; not for nationality, which we cannot ultimately lose, whoever opposes it."[28]

The Muslims fully exploited the eagerness of the Hindus for Muslim support, and grew more truculent in their attitude. In the annual session of 1908 the Muslim League passed resolutions demanding (1) extension of the principles of communal representation to Local Boards; (2) appointment of a Hindu and a Muslim on the Privy Council ; and (3) a due share for Muslims in all State services. It repudiated the Congress resolution. against the Partition of Bengal and pressed for "representation on a purely denominational basis." In support of all these, agitation was carried on in the press and on the platform, both in India and England. A British branch of the League was opened in London under the presidentship of Sir Syed Ameer Ail, for this purpose.

The inaugural meeting of the British Committee of the All-India Muslim League was held at the Caxton Hall, Westminister, on Wednesday, the 6th of May, 1908, under the presidentship of Syed Ameer Ali. He was the prime mover of the scheme of enlightening public opinion in England regarding the separatist tendencies of the Indian Musalmans, and the British Branch of the Muslim League continued to function under his direction, supervision and control. Even his inaugural address was marked by the spirit of distrust and isolation. He said: "It is impossible for them (the Mussalmans) to merge their separate communal existence in that of any other nationality or strive for the attainment of their ideals under the aegis of any other organisation than their own." This Branch of the League was later on actively helped by the All-India Muslim League and it left no stone unturned in influencing the British opinion. The fulfilment of the Muslim demands for separate electorate, weightage and reservation of seats was largely due to its activities undertaken under the enthusiastic zeal of Ameer Ali. [29]

V. COMMUNAL RIOTS

Reference has been made above[30] to serious communal riots in Bengal in the wake of the partition of the Province—in particular to a series of dangerous disturbances in My-

mensingh and Comilla Districts since 1907, in the course of which the Muslims committed great outrages on the Hindus. But the communal riots were not confined to Bengal.

In 1910 a severe riot borke out at Peshawar. Two years later there was a serious clash between the two communities at Ayodhya and Fyzabad on the occasion of the Muslim festival of Bakrid. Next year there was a similar riot at Agra on the occasion of Muhurrum. Sir John Hewett, the Governor of U. P. who lived in U. P. since 1875, remarked that the "differences were more acute and the feelings more bitter between the two communities in the United Provinces than they had been at any time during his residence there."

But the Bakrid disturbances at Shahabad (Bihar) in 1917 were perhaps the most serious which ever occurred during British rule up to that time. On 30 September, more than 25,000 Hindus attacked Ibrahimpur and neighbouring villages, and with great difficulty,, after a hand to hand fight with the rioters, the police restored order. But on 2 October rioting began again, simultaneously over a large part of the district, and for six days law and order practically disappeared from the area. Muslim houses were destroyed and their property looted; and the operations were directed by petty Hindu land-holders from elephants or horseback. On 9 October the disturbances spread to the adjoining rigions of the Gaya District, and over 30 villages were looted. Nearly one thousand were convicted under the Defence of India Act, and sentenced to various terms of imprisonment.

In 1918 riots broke out at Katarpur, six miles from Hardwar in U.P. Here, too, the Hindus burnt down Muslim houses in the course of which 30 Muslims were killed and sixty more were injured, including some women.[31]

CHAPTER IV

1. *Muslim League*, p. 66.
2. Ibid, 78.
3. Lovat Fraser, *India under Curzon*, pp. 391-2, f. n.
4. G. N. Singh, 378-80. Countess of Minto, 46-7.

5. The Countess of Minto says that the idea of separate electorate originated with Gokhale (p. 20, f. n.), but cites no evidence for such an important statement. In one of his speeches Gokhale suggested that there should be, *first*, general election on a territorial basis in which all communities should participate, and *then*, special separate, supplementary elections should be held to secure the fair and adequate representation of such important minorities as had received less than their full share in the general elections. *Speeches of G. K. Gokhale* (Natesan & Co.), p. 1138. But this is very different from the scheme accepted by Lord Minto. All the observations of Gokhale on this subject have been collected in the *Biography of Gokhale* by T. V. Parvate, pp. 311-19.
6. Prasad, R., *Divided India*, 112-3.
7. Presidential Address at the Cocanada Congress, 1923.
8. Countess of Minto, 47-8.
9. Buchan, 244.
10. Ramsay Macdonald, 176.
11. Prasad, R., op. cit., 115.
11a. Countess of Minto. 47-8.
12. Home Public Procs. October, 1893, Nos. 51-3.
13. Ram Gopal-1, 183-4.
14. *Muslim League*, 43. Singh, 384.
15. *Aligarh Institute Gazette*, 14 August, 1907, pp. 7-8. Quoted in *Muslim League*, 43.
16. M. Tufail Ahmad, *Roshon Mustaqbal*, pp. 363-4.
17. Savarkar, 29.
18. Fulller, 140-1.
19. Griffiths 309-10.
20. *MR.* III. 147.
21. *MR.* I. 579-591. The passage is taken from the translation of a chapter of Piriou's book, *L'Inde Contemporaine et le Mouvement Nationale.*
22. *Montagu-Chelmsford Report*, paras 228-231.
23. *Hindusthan Review*, April, 1909, p. 323.
24. Ramsay Macdonald, p. 129.
25. *Hindusthan Review*, April, 1909, p. 357.
26. *Speeches of G. K. Gokhale*, pp. 1137, 209.
27. Ibid, 1136.
28. *MR*, VII. 3.
29. *Muslim League*, 41-2.
30. See pp. 104-14.
31. *Report of the Statutory Commission*, Vol. IV, Part 1, pp. 97 ff.

CHAPTER V.

BRITISH POLITICS

I. POLICY OF REPRESSION

Lord Curzon had left a sea of troubles as his legacy to Lord Minto, who succeeded him. Bengal was already in a great ferment, but ere long the situation was rendered far more serious by the growth of terrorism. A detailed account of this has been given in the next Chapter. It will suffice to state here that a large number of secret societies were founded in Bengal whose members prepared bombs and collected revolvers in order to kill officials, particularly those who stood in their way. They also robbed a large number of Indian houses in order to collect money for defraying their expenses. The first definite indication of this was given by the discovery that a garden near Calcutta was being used for the purpose of preparing bombs, training in shooting and guerilla warfare, etc.

This new movement, which was officially designated as terrorism, was widely spread and was responsible for several murders—of both Indians and Europeans—and a large number of political dacoities (robbing as a part of political programme), whose perpetrators mostly evaded detection. Originating from the *Swadeshi* movement, the plant of terrorism flourished on the soil of the terrible regime of oppression launched by the Government, particularly by Sir Bamfylde Fuller, the Lieutenant-Governor of the newly created Province of Eastern Bengal and Assam, to which reference has already been made above.[1] Both Minto and Morley felt seriously disturbed by the activities of Fuller. Morley telegraphed a series of questions to Fuller and, not being satisfied with his replies, sent directives reversing his decision—an unprecedented procedure in the history of British rule in India. Minto had also to reverse Fuller's decisions. But neither Morley nor Minto was willing to remove Fuller from his post at the risk of a great outcry from officials and Anglo-Indians. At

last fortune favoured them. Being angered at the conduct of the pupils of two schools, Fuller recommended to the University of Calcutta that these two institutions should be disaffiliated. Lord Minto, having realized the unwisdom of the step, requested Fuller to withdraw his recommendation. But Fuller refused, saying that he would rather resign than withdraw his recommendation. Fuller, of course, never dreamt that Lord Minto would accept his resignation and thereby lower the prestige of the British administration. But, for once, the unexpected happened. Minto accepted Fuller's resignation and Morley approved of it. Evidently both were relieved at getting rid of the obnoxious man in a decent manner. Fuller's resignation increased the popularity of Minto, but did not stop terrorism or the agitation in Bengal.

The troubles were not, however, confined to Bengal. The Nationalist movement made good progress in the Punjab as in some other parts of India, and the same causes were in operation everywhere. In particular the Punjab was the chief stronghold of the Arya Samaj with its strong nationalist tendency inherited from the founder, Dayanand Sarasvati. The stirring events in Bengal since the Partition and the *Swadeshi* movement had their repercussion in the Punjab. Grave discontent and high excitement prevailed throughout the Province and there was a vigorous nationalist propaganda through the press and on the platform; but the revolutionary movement or terrorist organization did not make much headway as in Bengal. Nevertheless, the situation grew very tense in 1907-08; riots took place in Lahore and Rawalpindi, and the Indian editors and printers were imprisoned in large number for the national propaganda. The situation was further aggravated by the unwise action of the Local Government in respect of the Canal Colonies. The irrigation rates as well as the land-revenue were increased and the Government rushed through the Legislative Council a "Colonization Bill" taking away some of the privileges which were promised to the settlers in the Cheanab Colony by the Act of 1893. These measures were strongly resented and a number of public meetings were held to protest against them. The leaders of the movement were Ajit Singh and Syed Hyder Riza, who founded an organization called "Indian Patriots' Associa-

tion", and Lajpat Rai also occasionally addressed the public meetings, criticizing the Government measures.

The people of Rawalpindi District was specially affected by the increase of land-revenue. In a public meeting held on April 21, 1907, at Rawalpindi, Ajit Singh made a violent attack upon the increase of land assessment, calling upon the peasants to stop cultivation until the amount was reduced. Ajit Singh was, however, called to order by the President and left the meeting in rage.

Nevertheless, the Deputy Commissioner served a notice on the President and two other respectable pleaders to attend a public inquiry into the matter to be held on May 2, at 11 a.m. They regarded the notice as illegal and decided to disobey it. But there was a vast crowd near the Court on May 2, and it was swelled by a large number of labourers employed in Government and private workshops, who had gone on strike. The Deputy Commissioner did not arrive at the scene till 12-30, and according to telegraphic instructions from the Lieutenant-Governor, announced the postponement of the public inquiry. The crowd thereupon broke into violence, in course of which they "destroyed and burnt some furniture from a mission house and Church, and damaged some gardens and houses of Europeans, together with a Hindu workshop, where the men were on strike. The police did not appear but troops patrolled the town later."[2]

The Government now took vindictive measures not only against the three persons upon whom notice was served (who were not present in the scene of the riot), but also against three other prominent lawyers. They were arrested and kept in jail—no bail being allowed—during the hot months of the year (May to September), at the end of which, on October 1, the Magistrate acquitted them declaring hat the evidence was 'fabricated'. Sixty other persons were also arrested on account of the riot, of whom only five were convicted for riot and arson and sentenced to imprisonment for terms varying from three to seven years. The Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab became panicky at the rumour of the fiftieth anniversary of the Mutiny spread by an Anglo-Indian paper, and sent a highly exaggerated account of the state of things. The following summary of it was telegra-

phically communicated by the Viceroy, Lord Minto, to the Secretary of State on 8 May, 1907 :

'"Three days ago we received a weighty and urgent minute from Ibbetson on the present political situation in the Punjab... He describes a state of things giving rise to the greatest apprehension. Everywhere the extremists openly and continuously preach sedition, both in the press and at largely attended public meetings convened by them, while well-disposed classes stand aghast at our inaction and will, before long, in Ibbetson's opinion, begin to despise a Government which permits sedition to flourish unrebuked and submits to open and organized insult.

"The campaign of sedition assumes two main forms. In the towns of Lahore. Amritsar, Pindi, Ferozepore, Multan and other places,—[2a] has openly advocated the murder of high officials, and he and others have urged the people to rise, attack the English, and be free. In the country systematic efforts are being made to corrupt the yeomanry from whom the army is recruited. Special attention is given to Sikhs and military pensioners ; seditious leaflets are circulated to Sikh villages, and, at a public meeting at Ferozepore, where disaffection was openly preached, the men of the Sikh regiments stationed there were invited to attend, and several hundred were present. The Sikhs are told that they saved India for us in the Mutiny, that we are now ill-treating them, and that this is a judgment on them for betraying their country in her war of independence.....It is alleged that we wish to crush the flourishing indigenous industries of cotton and sugarcane ; it is said that we have taken the people's money and given them paper in return, and the villagers are asked who will cash our currency notes when we are gone. The people are urged to combine to withhold payment of Government revenue, water-rates, and other dues; to refuse supplies, carriages and other help to Government officers on tour, and native soldiers and police are pilloried as "traitors" and adjured to quit the service of the Government,

"This propaganda is organized and directed by a secret committee of the Arya Samaj, a society, originally religious, which has, in the Punjab, a strong political tendency."[3]

The Government regarded Lala Lajpat Rai as the "head

and centre of the entire movement" and Ajit Singh as his principal agent. So both of them were deported. Repressive measures were also in full swing in Eastern Bengal. But all this increased the spirit of resistance. Speeches and writings against the Government became more and more violent and terrorist activities grew more and more menacing. The Government adopted still more severe and autocratic measures. Terrorism and repression moved in a vicious circle.

The Seditious Meetings Act of 1907 severely restricted the right of holding public meetings. The Explosive Substances Act of 1908 laid down heavy penalty for possessing materials for manufacturing bombs, or helping in any way in the process. The Newspapers (Incitement to Offences) Act of 1908 placed the existence of a newspaper at the mercy of the Magistrate. The three well-known organs of the Extremist Party, namely the *Bande Mataram, Sandhya* and *Yugantar,* had to cease publication by the operation of this Act. The Criminal Law (Amendment) Act changed the system of trial for facilitating conviction, and armed the executive with almost unlimited powers over individual persons and political organizations. The Indian Press Act of 1910 laid down heavy fines, including forfeiture of press, for seditious publications, which were defined in such wide terms as to include almost any independent criticism of the Government. Books, newspapers, or other documents containing 'prohibited' matters were to be forfeited.

Thus public life was thoroughly stifled by imposing restrictions on public meetings and press, and rendering impartial justice almost impossible. The effect of the Press Act may be estimated from the fact that during the period 1909-19, over 350 presses and 300 newspapers were penalized and 500 publications proscribed; securities amounting to about Rupees five lakhs and a quarter were demanded, as a result of which 200 presses and 130 newspapers could not be started. Many leading journals, edited by Indians, felt the full weight of the iron hand of the Government.[4] The Government also prosecuted quite a large number of persons for seditious activities both under the old law and the new Acts. Mere suspicion by the police led to arrest and prosecution, and almost everyone tried was convicted. The penalties were always servere and a many

caess vindictive. Even the Secretary of State, John Morley, wrote to the Viceroy, Lord Minto : "When I read of the author (or printer) of a seditious pamphlet being punished with seven years of transporation, I feel restive." Morley characterized the sentences as 'indefensible, 'outrageous', and 'monstrous';[5] but could not prevent them. A veritable reign of terror was ushered in by Minto to suppress terrorism in Bengal.

In Maharashtra the Government prosecuted Tilak for seditious writings and he was sentenced to six years' transportation and a fine of Rs. 1,000. The news led to the closing of shops and strike of students, not only in Bombay but in many other parts of India. The mill-hands of Bombay also struck work and this led to riots with firings by the police and the military. The Muhammadans kept aloof from these demonstrations.

The Government had already deported Lajpat Rai and Ajit Singh of the Panjab, under the old Regulation III of 1818. At the time of the Third Maratha War this Regulation was passed, authorizing the Government to place a person under confinement as a State-prisoner without any trial. It was obviously intended to deal with recalcitrant Chiefs, but after the long interval of nearly a century the Government brought out this rusty weapon from their armoury to suppress terrorism. On 16 December, 1908, the Government of India issued order for deporting the following nine Bengali Hindus:—

1. Aswini Kumar Datta
2. Krishna Kumar Mitra
3. Satish Chatterjee
4. Subodh Mallik
5. Monoranjan Guha Thakurta
6. Shamsundar Chakravarti
7. Pulin Behari Das
8. Bhupesh Chandra Nag
9. Sachindra Prasad Basu

The first two were universally respected for their high moral character. The third was a Professor, and the fourth was evidently marked out for this penalty on account of his princely donation of a lakh of Rupees to the National Council of Education. Nos. 5 and 6 were well-known journalists of mature age. None of these

could be thought of as associated with any such dangerous terrorist or revolutionary activity which might bring them under the operation of Regulation III of 1818. Their deportation gave a rude shock to the whole of India, and its wisdom or justice was questioned by even many Birtish statesmen. Strong indignation was felt both in India and Britain. The Secretary of State had to sanction it much against his will, but public criticism at last forced him to change his policy, and the deportees were released on 9 February, 1910.

The repressive laws curtailing the liberty of the people to publicly express their views orally or in writing, and the prosecution of hundreds under those laws were continued in full force. The political movement went underground and terrorist activities in the shape of murder and dacoities also continued unchecked.

II. REFORMS.

Neither Morley nor Minto looked upon ruthless repression as the sole means of restoring peace and order. They also thought of giving a further instalment of reforms in order to enlist the sympathy and support of the more moderate section of the people. The two principles of 'Repression cum Reforms' and 'Rally the Moderates' became henceforth the watchword of the British politicians. To these two may be added the old policy of "Divide and Rule," which now meant in practice creating a split between the Hindus and Muhammadans by all possible means, and showing special favour to the latter. Minto may be said to be the chief exponent of all the three, but his claim may be justly challenged by Fuller, the first Lieutenant-Governor of East Bengal. It was he who compared himself to the King of Bengali folklore who had two queens *Suo* (beloved) and *Duo* (discarded), namely the Muslim and Hindu communities.[6] He was also the first to set in full force the machinery of repression in his Province. Unfortunately, his power of doing mischief was limited, and Minto had the advantage in this respect. He passed repressive laws in quick succession and put the final seal on a permanent Hindu-Muslim rift by his constitutional reforms. They were far more deadly in effect than anything that Fuller did or could possibly do.

Minto's claim to have initiated reforms also cannot go unchallenged. There are reasonable grounds to believe that the initiative was taken by John Morley, the Secretary of State for India. Howsoever that may be, the fact remains that some reforms were introduced in Indian administration, the essential features of which may be described as follows:

1. The appointment of an Indian member on the Viceroy's Executive Council, the first nominee being Sir Satyendra Prasanna Simha, a renowned Bengali Barrister of Calcutta.

2. The appointment of Indian members in Provincial Executive Councils, and sanction for the creation of such Councils where they did not exist.

3. The enlargement of Legislative Councils both in the Centre and the Provinces, by an increase of both nominated and elected members.

In the Act of 1909, the composition of the new Councils was based on two fundamental principles. First, that the Governor-General's Legislative Council must have a 'substantial', though not an 'overwhelming', majority of officials. Secondly, such official majority was not necessary for Provincial Legislative Councils, partly because their powers were very limited, and partly because the Head of the Government had the power to withhold assent to any measure passed by the Council. But the non-official majority did not necessarily mean a majority of elected non-official members. As a matter of fact, there was no such majority in any Province except Bengal. In all other Provinces the elected members constituted a minority, and the officials with the help of the nominated non-official members, who generally voted in favour of the Government, could always carry their points. In Bengal the Government could always depend upon Muslim votes in all crucial questions. Thus the Councils, as constituted under the Regulations framed by the Government of India under the Act, could not exercise any effective authority in administration. On the other hand, the introduction of communal electorate, i.e. election of Muslim members by Muslims only, drove a permanent wedge between the two communities and made it impossible for them to regard themselves as members of a common nationality. Minto thus

kept his pledge to the Muslim Deputation of 1906—a pledge which the Anglo-Indian officials regarded as a wise act of statesmanship, sufficient to put back the clock of Indian national progress by at least half a century.

Further, the Regulations framed by the Government of India under the Act also made sure that the Nationalists or Extremists might not take any share in the administration of their own country. This was secured in two ways. First, by the procedure of nomination, as the Government, having no restriction on their choice, selected only those *Jo-hukums* or yes-men whose subservience to the Government was above suspicion. Secondly, by those Regulations which (1) gave ample powers to the Government to disqualify any candidate for election whom they thought undesirable from their point of view, and (2) automatically disqualified a number of eminent leaders because they were deported or suffered imprisonment.

The Nationalists and the Extremists never felt any enthusiasm for the reforms of 1909. The Moderates, on the other hand, at first hailed the Reform proposals with unbounded jubilation, and the Indian National Congress passed a resolution expressing it, in its session held in December, 1908,—the first session after the purge of the Extremists. But the jubilation did not last even one full year. The Regulations under the Act were issued about five weeks before the next session of the Congress held at Lahore in December, 1909, which passed the following resolution:

"That this Congress while gratefully appreciating the earnest and arduous endeavours of Lord Morley and Lord Minto in extending to the people of this country a fairly liberal measure of constitutional reforms as now embodied in the India Councils Act of 1909, deems it its duty to place on record its strong sense of disapproval of the creation of separate electorates on the basis of religion and regrets that the Regulations framed under the Act have not been framed in the same liberal spirit in which Lord Morley's despatch of last year was conceived. In particular the Regulations have caused widespread dissatisfaction throughout the country by reasons of:

(a) the excessive and unfairly preponderant share of representation given to the followers of one particular religion;

(b) the unjust, invidious, and humiliating distinctions made between Muslim and non-Muslim subjects of His Majesty in the matter of the electorates, the franchise and the qualifications of candidates ;

(c) the wide, arbitrary and unreasonable disqualification and restrictions for candidates seeking election to the Councils ;

(d) the general distrust of the educated classes that runs through the whole course of the Regulations ; and

(e) the unsatisfactory composition of the non-official majorities in the Provincial Councils, rendering them ineffective and unreal for all practical purposes.

And this Congress earnestly requests the Government so to revise the Regulations, as soon as the present elections are over, as to remove these objectionable features, and bring them into harmony with the spirit of the Royal Message and the Secretary of State's despatch of last year."

In moving this Resolution Surendra Nath Banerji said : "It is no exaggeration to say that the Rules and Regulations have practically wrecked the Reform scheme as originally conceived with a beneficence of purpose and a statesmanlike grasp that did honour to all that are assoiated with it.....Who wrecked the scheme ? Who converted that promising experiment into a dismal failure ? The responsibility rests upon the shoulders of the bureaucracy.....Is the bureaucracy having its revenge upon us for the part we have played in securing these concessions ?"

Thus the Reforms of 1909 were a still-born child. They satisfied no party and, to use the words of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report, "afforded no answer, and could afford no answer to Indian political problems." By an irony of fate, in the very first session of the newly constituted Imperial Legislative Council, the Government passed the Indian Press Act of 1910, with the support of the non-official Indian members, including Gokhale. The nature of this repressive Act has been mentioned aboye. The support of the Moderates to such a measure shows how far they had drifted away from the Nationalists.

Towards the end of 1910 India had a new Viceroy, Lord Hardinge, and a new Secretary of State, Lord Crewe, in place, respectively, of Lord Minto and Lord Morley. Both Hardinge

and Crewe felt that the unrest in India was chiefly due to the Partition of Bengal, and there would be no peace until this grievous wrong was remedied. The initiative in the matter was taken by Crewe, but the new Viceroy was afraid to take any step as it was opposed by all the high officials whom he consulted. But as soon as Hardinge realized the seriousness of the situation in the two Bengals, he made up his mind and carried his whole Council with him. Advantage was taken of the visit of their Royal Majesties, George V and Queen Mary, to India to announce the new proposals in the *Delhi Durbar* on 12 December, 1911.

So far as Bengal was concerned, the *status quo* was not restored. The capital of British India was removed from Calcutta to Delhi and the territories comprised in the two Bengals were redistributed as follows :

1. Bihar, Chotanagpur and Orissa were constituted into a Province under a Lieutenant-Governor.
2. Assam reverted to a Chief-Commissionership.
3. The rest constituted the Province of Bengal under a Governor.

The annulment of the partition of Bengali-speaking region was, no doubt, highly welcome in Bengal. But it came too late to check the growth of nationalism—including its militant aspect —to which that unfortunate measure gave birth. This was highlighted by the bomb thrown at Lord Hardinge on 23 December, 1912, on the occasion of his State entry into Delhi, the new capital-city of India. Lord Hardinge was badly wounded ; the man holding the umbrella over him was killed, and another servant seriously wounded. As there was no terrorist outrage for about a year since the annulment of the Partition of Bengal, Hardinge fondly believed that he had successfully checked the revolutionary movement. But the bomb thrown at him opened his eyes. "I literally wept", said he, "with disappointment, feeling that all the improvement I had noted in the general situation had disappeared through the wanton act of the miscreants who had planned it".[7] He was right only in part ; what he failed to understand was that he had to deal, not with individual miscreants, but a great national movement. So his first instinct of misgivings gave way to the old complacent belief that 'he

would have no more trouble from the people of India who would give him the most loyal support'. He was strengthened in his belief by the assurance of Gokhale that he and his party would never oppose him. The history of the next five years showed, what should have been clear to any far-sighted statesman, that Gokhale and his party had ceased to count in Indian politics. New India was being heralded by the cry for Home Rule in public and conspiracy for armed revolt on a big scale in secret. They were in full swing even when Lord Hardinge was still on Indian soil, living in his fool's paradise.

FOOTNOTES

1. See pp. 63 ff., 88 ff., 104 ff.
2. Nevinson, p. 19.

2a. The name of the person is omitted in the printed extract and only indicated by a dash. Most probably it refers to Ajit Singh.

3. Countess of Minto. pp. 124-5
4. Ghose, *The Press and Press Laws in India*, pp, 39-40. A complete list of the victims of the Press Act is given on pp. 92-99 of this book. The Government placed before the Indian Legislative Council a detailed statement of the action taken under the Press Act during the period from 1910 to 1913.
5. Morley, 269-70.
6. See pp. 111-12; Fuller, 140.
7. Hardinge, 81.

CHAPTER VI

MILITANT NATIONALISM

I. EARLY REVOLUTIONARY ACTIVITIES IN BENGAL

1. The Influence of *Swadeshi* Movement

A brief reference has been made above to the foundation of the *Anusilan Samiti*, the first organized revolutionary secret society in Bengal.[1] The *Anusilan Samiti* carried on its activities, partly in public and partly in secret. There were clubs for training youths in all sorts of physical drill and exercises, such as *lathi*, sword, and dagger-play, riding, swimming, and in some cases, also boxing. All this was openly done and attracted quite a large number of young men. But they formed only the outer circle. There was an inner circle, consisting of a select few, who organized the revolutionary activities. Needless to add that the inner circle was constantly strengthened by recruits from the outer circle.

The revolutionary movement in India has been described as terrorist and anarchical in official reports. Terrorism was certainly one of its general features; but anarchy, as it is generally understood, formed no part of its creed. The revolutionaries never favoured, much less worked for, a state of anarchy, leading to chaos and confusion, such as was the case with the nihilists in Russia. So far, therefore, as ultimate aim was concerned, they were in full agreement with the nationalists. The difference was only in respect to the means to be adopted in order to achieve the freedom of India, which was their common aim.

As regards the method to be pursued, there were two schools of thought among the revolutionaries. One believed in armed conflict against the British with the help of the Indian soldiers and pinned its faith on the development of international situation which might create a favourable opportunity and bring necessary help from outside. The other held that terrorism in the shape

of murdering officials would paralyze the machinery of Government and bring it to its knees. Both, however, felt the urgent need of creating a revolutionary spirit in the country at large, so that the people may be ready to strike at the opportune moment. Military training and collection of arms in secret formed a common programme of both.

Money was required for maintaining the activities of both the sections. At first, . subscriptions from friends and patrons sufficed for the purpose. But as the activities grew, this source proved very inadequate and the need was felt of extorting money from the rich and the affluent. This was regarded by the revolutionaries as 'forced taxes from those who are in a position to pay'. Sometimes they treated such money as 'forced loan' to be repaid with interest when *Swaraj* was established in India. There are cases on record where the person whose money was looted received an acknowledgement of the debt with a promise to repay it with interest.

This was the genesis of the so-called political dacoities which loom large among the early activities of the revolutionaries. Some early instances have been referred to in the statement of Satis Chandra Basu quoted above.[2] It has also been explicitly stated by him that neither P. Mitra, President of the *Anusilan Samiti,* nor Sister Nivedita approved of this. As a matter of fact political dacoities were always repugnant to a section of the revolutionaries. They feared that, in the first place, these might demoralize the workers, and what was begun for public interest might be later influenced by motives of private gain and selfish interest. Secondly, the dacoities would alienate public sympathy from the movement. The only argument on the opposite side was the need of funds to carry on the essential revolutionary activities such as procuring arms, maintaining the organizations, and carrying on propaganda work both at home and abroad. It has been stated by a revolutionary that they approached wealthy and influential men such as Rash Bihari Ghosh and C. R. Das, and plainly told them that they would desist from dacoities if supplied with adequate funds from other sources. But as there was no hope of any such windfall, the political dacoities formed a permanent feature of the revolutionary movement in Bengal. For, between the two alternatives of political

dacoities and cessation of all revolutionary activities, particularly preparations for an armed revolution, many chose the former.

The underground movement did not assume serious proportions before 1905 when the Partition of Bengal, followed by the *Swadeshi* movement, stirred the political and national consciousness of Bengal to a degree unknown before. The character of this movement has been described above, in Chapter II. It is only necessary to state here that the revolutionary activities got a great impetus from this movement. The spirit of a new national consciousness swept the old political ideas almost out of existence, and swelled the rank of militant nationalists. At first the boycott of English goods and other elements of *Swadeshi* movement made a strong appeal to the people, but as these proved ineffective in achieving the desired object, a steadily increasing number of young men turned to revolutionary activties as the only possible means to attain their end.

The *Anusilan Samiti* got a large number of recruits, and hundreds of branches were started in different parts of Bengal. But while more young men joined the revolutionary *Samiti*, some elderly leaders dissociated themselves from it. Bipin Chandra Pal, for example, preached the gospel of *Swadeshi*, Boycott, and Passive Resistance. He was shortly joined by C. R. Das who left the secret society. In spite of these defections the revolutionary movement got a great fillip from the *Swadeshi* movement and its activities were widened and intensified to an astonishing degree.

In 1905 Mr. P. Mitra, the President of the *Anusilan Samiti*, undertook a tour in East Bengal during the *Swadeshi* agitation, and enrolled Pulin Das of Dacca as a member of the *Samiti*. He then organized the activities of the *Anusilan Samiti*. Its Head Office was to continue at Calcutta, with a second headquarter in Dacca under Pullin Das. Most of the districts of East Bengal, however, were beyond his jurisdiction and directly affiliated to the Calcutta Centre.

In 1906 there was a Conference of the revolutionaries in the house of Subodh Mallik in Calcutta, which was attended by members from the various districts who submitted reports on the progress of work within their respective jurisdictions. A similar Conference was again held in 1907. Some eminent Bengalis,

like Maharaja Suryakanta, helped the revolutionaries with money. Less opulent men also offered help at considerable sacrifice.

2. The Cult of the Bomb

The spearhead of the revolutionary movement was formed by a band of young men under the leadership of Barindra Kumar Ghose, younger brother of Arabinda Ghose, whose revolutionary activities have been noted above. Barindra imbibed these ideas when he stayed with his brother at .Baroda for about a year, studying history and political literature. In 1902 he came back to Bengal with the idea of preaching the cause of independence as a political missionary. He worked among the English-educated classes and made an extensive tour all over Bengal. But although he succeeded in spreading revolutionary ideas to a certain extent, he was thoroughly disappointed with the response to his efforts, and returned to Baroda in 1903. After one year he returned to Bengal. He was convinced by his previous tour that a purely political propaganda would not be sufficient, but that people must be trained spiritually to face dangers. With this view he gathered round him a group of enthusiastic young men, chief of whom were Abinash Bhattacharyya and Bhupendra Nath Datta. Their chief activities were educating the boys in religious doctrines and politics. Barindra collected school-boys and gave them religious, moral and political education. His associate, Upendra Nath Banerji, says that he was chiefly engaged in teaching boys all about the state of our country and the need of independence, and that the only way left for us is to fight for independence and to start secret societies in different parts of the country in order to propagate revolutionary ideas, collect arms, and rise in rebellion when the time shall be ripe.

At first Barindra and his associates devoted their chief attention to the propagation of their ideas and ideals among the public. They sent out members for this purpose to Provinces outside Bengal, such as Bihar, Orissa and even so far south as Madras. But the chief means of propaganda was the publication of books and periodicals to preach the gospel of revolution. The first book, entitled *Bhawani Mandir,* published in 1905, gives detailed plan of establishing a religious sanctuary as the basis

or centre of revolutionary activities—a temple of the goddess Bhawani in a secluded spot, far from human habitation, in a calm and serene atmosphere. This was to be the centre of a new order of political devotees. These might or might not become *Sanyasis* (ascetics), but were to lead the life of *Brahmachari* (novice), and would return to the life of a householder only when the object was achieved. This object was the freedom of India from the foreign yoke. The book is a very remarkable one, and lays main stress on the glorification of Kali under the names of Sakti and Bhawani, and preaching of the gospel of force and physical strength as the necessary condition of political freedom. The central theme of the work was the organization of a band of workers who would prepare the way for revolution in India and should have no other attachment in life. There is no doubt that this central idea was taken from Bankim Chandra's *Anandamath* to which reference has been made above, and it is a further evidence of the great infiuence exercised by that book upon the revolutionary activities in Bengal. But although the book eulogizes Sakti or physical strength, there is no reference to violence or crime.

This, however, makes its appearance in the next book, entitled *'Bartaman Rananiti'* which was published in 1907 by Abinash Chandra Bhattacharyya. The entire book is an eloquent plea for military training and the necessity of war for the achievement of India's freedom. It discusses various military details, specially those of guerilla warfare, by which the youths will gradually become fearless and experts in sword-play and other tactics. The young revolutionaries are urged to develop in themselves qualities of a hero so that they may fearlessly face dangers.

The other adventure of this group was still more audacious. It is the publication of a periodical named *Yugantar* (New Era) which openly preaced sedition and disloyalty in order to create the necessary revolutionary mentality among the people. It was started in March, 1906, and its early history has been briefly given by Abinash Chandra Bhattacharyya who, along with Barindra Ghose and Bhupendra Datta, were its chief promoters. "Our paper, *Yugantar*", says he, "was dedicated to the service of the country and was the first newspaper of the revolutionary

party. It was first printed for three weeks at the press of our party member P. C. Majumdar, and then we had our own press".[2a] How they found money to carry on the paper is merely hinted at in the following passage of Abinash Bhattacharyya's statement. "Maharaja Suryakanta helped us with money, but we got the greatest help from Abinash Chandra Chakravarti, who was a Munsiff, but resigned his post and sacrificed everything for the country." The *Yugantar* openly preached revolution against the British Government, and even suggested methods to be adopted for the purpose. The following extract from the Sedition (Rowlatt) Committee's report (pp. 22-3) gives a fairly accurate idea of its writings :

"This journal began to pour forth racial hatred in March 1906, attained a circulation of 7,000 in 1907, and rapidly reached a still wider range before it ceased to appear in 1908 in consequence of newly passed Newspapers (Incitement to Offences) Act. Its character and teaching entirely justify the comments of the Chief Justice, Sir Lawrence Jenkins, quoting and adopting the following words of the Sessions Judge of Alipore. 'They exhibit a burning hatred of the British race, they breathe revolution in every line, they point out how revolution is to be effected. No calumny and no artifice is left out which is likely to instil the people of the country with the same idea or to catch the impressionable mind of youth'. We will here give two passages, both published when the paper was in its mid-career, which announced to thousands of people how the revolutionaries proposed to accomplish their object. One appeared in the issue of August the 12th, 1907. After dilating on the ease with which [illegible] could be collected and bombs manufactured, provided that [illegible]cy was maintained, the article proceeded: 'There is [illegible]ier very good means of acquiring strength of arms. Many [illegible]le have observed in the Russian revolution that there are many partizans of the revolutionaries among the Czar's troops. These troops will join the revolutionists with various arms. This method succeeded well during the French Revolution. The revolutionists have additional advantages where the ruling power is a foreign power, because the latter has to recruit most of its troops from among the subject people. Much work can be done by the revolutionists very cautiously spreading the gospel of

independence among these native troops. When the time arrives for a practical collision with the ruling power, the revolutionists not only get these troops among their ranks, but also the arms with which the ruling power supplied them. Besides, all the enthusiasm and courage of the ruling power can be destroyed by exciting a serious alarm in its mind'. The other appeared on the 26th of the same month. It purports to be a letter from a mad *Yogi* (devotee); "Dear Editor,—I hear that copies of your paper are being sold by thousands in the bazar. If at least fifteen thousand copies are distributed in the country, nearly sixty thousand people read them. I cannot withhold the temptation of telling a certain thing to these sixty thousand people and am therefore taking up my pen untimely.....I am mad and crack-brained and a sensation-monger. The cup of my delight becomes full when I see unrest descending in all directions: like deaf dumbness I cannot rest any longer. News of loot is reaching me from all quarters, and I am dreaming as if the future guerilla bands were looting money and as if the future war had commenced in the shape of petty dacoities (gang robberies) .....O Plunder, I worship you to-day, be our helpmate. You so long hid yourself like a canker in a flower and ate away the country's substance. Come and do again here and there resuscitate the old martial spirit behind the public eye.....You made me promise that day that by your grace, the Indians when they remembered and worshipped you would get both the money to arm themselves and the military training. That is why I worship you to-day".

A number of select articles from the *Yugantar* were published in the form of a book entitled *Mukti Kon Pathe*. The following account of this book is given in the Report of the sedition Committee (pp. 24-5).

"At an early stage the book denounces the 'smallness and lowness' of the ideals of the National Congress. It indicates the correct attitude for recruits to follow in regard to current agitations. 'The bands may always join such agitations and undertakings regarding different contemporary events which the present leaders of the country always wish us to join. But it should always be a first consideration that in the matter of those undertakings alone which extend over the whole country and which

raise a desire for liberty, the bands are to join wholeheartedly and to try to be in the foremost ranks.....In the present circumstances of our country there is no lack of undertakings and agitations regarding it ; and by the grace of God, the Bengalis are everywhere being initiated by these efforts into love of the country and a determination to obtain liberty. Therefore let these be by no means disregarded. But if these agitations be joined in without the ideal of freedom being cherished in the heart, real strength and training will never be acquired from them. Therefore as the members of the band will, on the one hand, stake their lives on increasing the scope of the bands, so on the other they should remain persevering and active in keeping the country excited by these undertakings and agitations.'

"The book further points out that not much muscle was required to shoot Europeans ; that arms could be procured by grim determination and that weapons could be prepared silently in some secret place. Indians could be sent to foreign countries to learn the art of making weapons. The assistance of Indian soldiers must be obtained. They must be made to understand the misery and wretchedness of the country. The heroism of Sivaji must be remembered. As long as revolutionary work remained in its infancy, expenses could be met by subscriptions. But as work advanced, money must be exacted from society by the application of force. If the revolution is being brought about for the welfare of society, then it is perfectly just to collect money from society for the purpose. It is admitted that theft and dacoity are crimes because they violate the principle of the good of society. But the political dacoit is aiming at the good of society, 'so no sin but rather virtue attaches to the destruction of this small good for the sake of some higher good. Therefore if revolutionaries extort money from the miserly or luxurious member of society by the application of force, their conduct is perfectly just.'

"*Mukti Kon Pathe* further exhorts its readers to obtain the 'help of the native soldiers.....Although these soldiers for the sake of their stomach accept service in the Government of the ruling power, still they are nothing but men made of flesh and blood. They too know (how) to think ; when therefore the revolutionaries explain to them the woes and miseries of the

country, they, in proper time, swell the ranks of the revolutionaries with arms and weapons given them by the ruling power..... Because it is possible to persuade the soldiers in this way, the modern English Raj of India does not allow the cunning Bengalis to enter into the ranks of the army.....Aid in the shape of arms may be secretly obtained by securing the help of the foreign ruling powers."

Such were the views of the small group of revolutionaries who centred round Barindra Kumar Ghosh. But Barindra and his friends were no mere visionaries. They were actually thinking of a far-off revolution, and in order to be ready for it they were collecting weapons in small quantities. Altogether they collected 11 revolvers, 4 rifles and 1 gun. Ullashkar Datta who joined this group had learned the manufacture of explosives, and with his help arrangements were made for preparing bombs at a secluded place near Deoghur. The first test had a tragic end as one of the party died of untimely explosion of the bomb. Later, the bombs were successfully made in small quantities in a garden house at 32, Muraripukur Road, at the outskirts of Calcutta. Shri Hen Chandra Das who went to Paris by selling part of his property, in order to learn mechanism of explosives, came back and joined Datta in preparing explosives and bombs. After conducting the *Yugantar* for one year and a half they gave up their connection with the newspaper and devoted their whole attention to terrorist activities.

Barindra and his friends were engaged in manufacturing bombs with a view to killing the Government officials who adopted repressive measures against the revolutionaries or were mainly instrumental in doing the same. The first bomb was prepared with the definite object of killing Sir Bamfylde Fuller, the Lieutenant-Governor of Eastern Bengal, whose oppressive measures have been referred to in Chapters II and V. It is interesting to note that Surendra Nath Banerji, the leader of the Moderates, instigated the crime and even promised to raise seven to eight thousand rupees for this purpose.[3] Prafulla Chaki, a young man of seventeen, was specially deputed to carry out the scheme, but he did not succeed. Next, an attempt was made to blow up the train in which the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal was travelling on December 6, 1907. The train was actually derailed by a

bomb near Midnapur, but there was no casualty, nor much damage to the train. Their next attempt was to murder Mr. Kingsford who, as Chief Presidency Magistrate, had ordered Susil, almost a boy, to be severely flogged for a comparatively minor offence. Mr. Kingsford was then the Judge at Muzaffarpur (Bihar). Two members of the party, named Prafulla Chaki, mentioned above, and Khudiram Bose, were sent to Muzaffarpur for the purpose. They threw a bomb at a carriage, which resembled that of Kingsford, but really belonged to one Mr. Kennedy, with the result that the wife and daughter of the latter were killed. Prafulla was going to be arrested when he shot himself dead, and Khudiram was tried and hanged. The incident took place on April 30, 1908. Two days later the Murari-pukur garden was searched by the police and bombs, dynamite, and cartridges were seized. Thirty-four persons, including Arabinda Ghose, Barindra, and his principal associates, were arrested and charged with conspiracy. The Public Prosecutor, who conducted the case at Alipur, and a Deputy-Superintendent of Police, who was attending the appeal of the Alipur Conspiracy case in the High Court, Calcutta, were both shot dead. Of the accused, fifteen were ultimately found guilty, and four of them, including Barindra, were transported for life. Three were transported for 10, four for 7 and three for 5 years. Arabinda Ghose was acquitted.

It would appear from the brief account given above that Barindra and his associates could not carry on the revolutionary activity beyond the preliminary stage. But when they were arrested and their activities, particularly manufacture of bombs,[4] came out in the Alipur Conspiracy case, it created a great sensation all over the country. Very few in India could really believe before this that there could be an organized attempt to overthrow the British Government by means of bombs. The courage and the self-sacrificing spirit of the young men proved to be a great inspiration to hundreds of others, and although Barindra failed to achieve any conspicuous success, he may claim the credit (or discredit as some might say) of having set the revolutionary organization in Bengal on a firm footing, and given it a definite character and direction which it retained till the end.

Another revealing fact was the almost universal sympathy felt for the revolutionaries. The accused in the Alipore Conspiracy case were regarded as martyrs to their country, and those like Prafulla Chaki and Khudiram, who had lost their lives, became heroes of folk songs sung all over the country. Even professional beggars substituted these for their traditional religious songs while begging from house to house. The calm indifference of the revolutionaries who were daily brought from the prison to the court-room during the prolonged trial, excited the admiration even of those who did not share their views. With the Damocles' sword hanging over their heads, they chatted among themselves and laughed and cut jokes as if nothing had happened. One day when the prisoners were assembled in the court-room some time before the judge was due, one of them began to sing a patriotic song composed by Rabindra Nath Tagore, a few lines from which are translated below:—

"Blessed is my birth, my birth in this land;
In loving you, O Mother, I've found
The best fulfilment of my birth.
Thy light soothed my eyes when I first opened them.
May I close my eyes with thy light shining upon them."

It is reported that there was a pindrop silence when this song was being sung in a melodious tune, with a feeling of pathos natural to one who was perhaps going to close his eyes very soon for serving his motherland. The lawyers, visitors, and even the menials who crowded the room, listened with rapt attention, with tears flowing from their eyes, and nobody thought of stopping the young man, almost a boy, who poured out the inmost thought and desire of his mind in a melodious strain.

It is generally believed that it was Narendra Gosain, son of a rich *zamindar* and a member of the party, who had first divulged the secret of the society to the police, and thus enabled them to trap the whole revolutionary band at the Muraripukur garden[4a]. In any case he turned an approver, but was murdered inside the jail[4b] by two revolutionary prisoners, Kanai Lal Datta and Satyen Bose, in order that his confession might not be treated as evidence. The news of his death was hailed with joy all over Bengal, and his murderers were regarded

as heroes and martyrs. When Kanai Lal Datta was hanged for his crime, his dead body was carried in a funeral procession which kings and conquering heroes well might envy. Calcutta was in tears, and thousands behaved as if they belonged to Kanai's family. A dense crowd, bare-footed and with tears in eyes, thronged the street and followed the bier, which was covered with heaps of flowers and *laja* (fried paddy) thrown by the weeping women from the balconies of the houses on the two sides of the narrow Kalighat Road. The place of cremation was a sea of human heads. Hundreds, probably thousands, fasted the whole day and night. The Government was so much unnerved at this spontaneous demonstration (witnessed by the author of this book), that they never, in future, allowed the dead of revolutionaries to be carried in public. Indeed it may be said that Barin and his associates not only made the cult of bomb popular, but also gave it a honoured place in the struggle for freedom. One day Barin accosted in the court the Deputy-Superintendent, who was later murdered, and told him: "Well, uncle Alam, three bombs have brought Morley-Minto Reform—would be coming, beware!" He was voicing the opinion of Bengal.

3. Anusilan Samiti.

Events soon proved that even outside the narrow circle of Barindra, the teachings of the *Yugantar* did not fall on deaf ears. There is positive evidence to show that the different forms of revolutionary activities hinted at in the *Yugantar* were actually carried out in practice. Several attempts were made to commit political dacoities soon after the *Yugantar* was started, but they did not prove very successful. In October, 1907, a *coollie* (foot man), carrying a bag full of money, was stabbed at Netaigunj in the Dacca district, but as the money was scattered around, the revolutionaries probably could not secure much. A more successful operation took place in the village Harinpara (P.S. Shibpur, Dt. Howrah), not far from Calcutta, where on April 3, 1908, seven men armed with knives and pistols robbed cash and ornaments of the value of Rs. 400. In 1907 Sasikumar De was killed on suspicion that he was a spy. On December

23, 1907, Mr. Allen, a former Magistrate of Dacca, was shot at Goalundo, but the wound did not prove fatal. On April 11, 1908, a bom was thrown into the house of the Mayor of Chandernagar, who had recently passed an ordinance restricting the traffic in arms.

The imprisonment of Barindra and his associates no doubt removed 30 to 40 revolutionaries, but the revolutionary movement was not crushed. On 15th May, 1908, there was a bomb outrage in Calcutta, and between June and the end of the year there were four more cases of bombs thrown into railway carriages. None of these had any serious consequence, as only a few persons were injured, but they showed that the cult of the bomb did not rise and fall with Barin and his associates, but had come to stay. A big factory for making bombs was set up at a house in Bagbazar (296/1 Upper Circular Road.)

Indeed it may even be urged, that although with the Alipore Conspiracy case Barindra's small group of heroes passed out of the history of revolutionary movement in Bengal, the movement itself not only did not languish or die out, but rather gained fresh momentum. The *Anusilan Samiti,* the parent organization of the revolutionary movement, continued its work with unabated vigour. The number of recruits to the inner circle increased, and many of them practically dedicated their lives to the cause. They left their hearth and home, and to a certain extent carried into practice the ideal preached in he *Bhawani Mandir.* They did not adopt the life of recluse in inaccessible hills but, equally indifferent to joys of life and fear of death, they devoted themselves heart and soul to the propagation of the new cult of violence among the educated youths of Bengal.

Two features of this new cult emphasized by Barindra and his group, viz., manufacture of bombs and murder of officials in order to paralyze the administration, did not appeal to a group of revolutionaries. The adoption of this programme by the Barindra group created a split in the revolutionary party. P. Mitra, President of the *Anusilan Samiti,* was not inclined to start violent activities immediately. So a new party or group was formed within the *Anusilan Samiti,* with Sri Arabinda as its President. The nature of the split and the reasons behind have been described by Sri Jadu Gopal Mukherji,[4c] one of the

most notable among the revolutionary leaders, who is happily still alive.

He objected to the cult of bomb as isolated outrages were not likely to achieve the end. In Russia the Nihilists killed the Czar, Alexander II, but the future Czars that followed were more secure and ran their race of oppression and suppression. He impressed upon the advocates of bomb 'that revolution was a four-pronged effort. The youth, labour, peasant, and army were its constituents. If we don't work among them and bring them to our way of thinking, the whole programme will fizzle out.' They pointed out that it was a long-drawn-out process, and asked: 'When do you mean to strike ?'. I told them—'A war between England and Germany is imminent, and England's adversity is India's opportunity.' There was intense heart-searching and brain-racking. I was outvoted. The lure of bomb, the prospect of immediate retaliation and breaking the morale of British administration were too tempting to wait. But being the minority, we remained steadfast in our conviction. In those days I used to take up Mazzini classes weekly. Our listeners went on swelling in number.'

This broad line of difference was at the root of creating further split in the revolutionary party and giving rise to different groups. Apart from Barin Ghose and his immediate associates, who had a very short career, we find two distinct groups, one headed by Pulin Das in East Bengal, with his headquarters in Dacca, and the other, first under P. Mitra, and after his death, under Jatindra Mukherji and Jadugopal Mukherji. A third group under Rash Behari Bose was also distinct from the two mentioned above. There were also many other small splinter groups.

Before we proceed to describe the principal activities of these groups, it is necessary to stress the fact that in spite of difference in ideology and the *modus operandi*, not only was there no ill-feeling or rivalry, but a friendly association existed between them. Each group maintained secrecy in respect of its recruits and actual operations, but the leaders of different groups were in close touch with one another, and each freely offered to the other, if need arose, not only pecuniary help, but even asylum to its members hunted by the police. Instances of such friendly

co-operation will be found in the course of the detailed narrative that follows. Many living members of the different revolutionary groups have testified to this spirit of mutual understanding and forbearance. Individual exceptions are bound to occur in big organizations of this type, and human nature being as it is, personal jealousy and rivalry, and a spirit of exaggerating the services of one's own party and undervaluing that of another, were not altogether absent among the rank and file. But the leading personalities in each group seem to have been above all this. They not only honoured and respected, but even took one another into confidence, as regards the general line of policy and, in some cases, in respect of major policy operations

4. Revolutionary Centre at Chandernagore

Like the Anusilan Samiti of Calcutta a revolutionary centre grew up at Chandernagore from a Society named Bandhab Sammilani founded in 1902, and its activity expanded on similar lines during the Swadeshi Movement. There was an inner circle whose members were trained in revolver shooting by Professor Charu Chandra Roy of Dupleix College. It became the chief revolutionary centre in Bengal after the Alipore Conspiracy Case and the proclamation of the Anusilan Samiti as unlawful in September, 1909. This Samiti had close connection with Barin Ghosh's Group and many of its prominent members were also leading members of the latter. Both Kanai Lal Datta and Satyen Bose who murdered Naren Gosain and those who supplied them the revolvers for the purpose were members of the Chandernagore Group. Upendra Banerjee was also a leading member of both the Groups. Since 1909 it carried on the work under the able guidance of Sri Motilal Roy, the founder of the Prabartak Sangha of Chandernagore. Being situated beyond the jurisdiction of the British Government it served as a great asylum to political refugees or absconders, and even Arabinda Ghose was given shelter by Motilal Roy when the former had to leave Calcutta to avoid British prosecution. It also became the chief centre of the manufacture of bombs. One of the early overt acts of this Group was throwing a bomb within the Writers' Building

on 2 March, 1911, by Nani Gopal Mukherji. There were five different centres for the preparation and stock-piling of bombs at Chandernagore.

5. Dacca Anusilan Samiti.

The most important of all the branches in which the original *Anusilan Samiti* was split up was the one at Dacca which soon developed into an independent parallel institution under the leadership of Pulin Behari Das. This alone retained up to the very end the original name *Anusilan Samiti* while the other branches came to be known either by different geographical names such as West Bengal, Calcutta, Madaripur, Barisal, North Bengal, Chandernagore, etc., or according to their leaders. Fortunately, there are abundant materials regarding the organization and activities of the *Dacca Anusilan Samiti,* which, according to the Sedition Committee Report, "was throughout the whole period the most powerful of these associations". As an account of this gives us a fair idea not only of the parent institution but also of the other branches, we might deal with the history of this branch in some detail, mainly under the following heads[5] :—

A. Initiation into Membership.
B. Organization.
C. Activities.

A. Initiation into Membership

Pulin Das was initiated into membership by P. Mitra, Founder-President of the *Anusilan Samiti.* Pulin has himself described the ceremony as follows:

"According to the directions of P. Mitra at Calcutta I took only a single meal,—a vegetarian one—on a certain day. Next day I took my bath in the Ganga and went to the residence of Mitra for initiation. Mitra performed a *Yajna* (sacred sacrificial ceremony) with lamp, incense, flowers, and other offerings and recited only Vedic *mantras* from the *Chhandogya Upanishad.* I then sat in *alidha* posture (the right knee being advanced and the left leg retracted). Mitra sat to my right and placed a copy of the *Gita* with a sword above it on my head. A paper with some vows written on it was brought and holding it with both my hands I took the vows before the sacrificial fire. I then bowed my head both before Mitra and the sacrificial fire."[6]

This ceremony was also followed by Pulin Das while initiating members. When a large number of people had to be initiated he took them to the temple of Siddheswari Kali in a lonely suburb of the town of Dacca. The members sat before the image of the goddess Kali and took the vow with the *Gita* and a sword on their heads. At the end of the initiation the members took pure *ghee* and also drank unboiled milk with sugar.

It is to be understood that such formal initiation was only meant for the members of the inner circle. Those belonging to the outer circle had not to pass through such an elaborate ceremony. There were really four kinds or classes of members and they had to take different vows. These four vows were known as (a) Initial Vow ; (b) The Final Vow ; (c) The First Special Vow ; and (d) The Second Special Vow. The Initial Vow consisted of a promise to follow the rules of the *Samiti*, to carry out implicitly the orders of the authorities, to speak nothing but the truth to the leader, and never to conceal anything from him.

The Final Vow enjoyed upon the member not to divulge internal matters of the *Samiti* to any one, to keep the authorities informed about his movement and of any sort of conspiracy against the *Samiti* which might come to his knowledge, and to keep secret all the instructions except from members.

The First Special Vow ran as follows :

"I will not go away leaving this *Samiti* until its object is fulfilled. I will not be bound by the tie of affection for father, mother, brother, sister, hearth and home, etc., and I will, without putting forward any excuse, perform all the work of the *Samiti* under orders of the leader....."

The Second Special Vow ran as follows :

"I will do all the work of the *Samiti* for its development, staking my life and everything that I possess. I will carry out all commands, oppose those who are inimical to the *Samiti*, and do injury to them to the utmost of my power. I will never discuss the inner secrets with anybody, even my relations and friends."

These vows were printed and each member for initiation had to read them out and signify his readiness to abide by them. It

appears from some of the rules that the members were generally expected to be boys of tender age. It is hardly necessary to add that almost in every respect there was differential treatment between the members who took only the first vow and those who took the second, third, or the fourth vow.

B. Organization

There was a network of *Samitis* throughout the length and breadth of Bengal. For the sake of good management the whole of Bengal was divided into a number of graded organizational units in the following order, each of which supervised the work of a number of those mentioned next. These were (a) District Samiti ; (b) Mahakuma Samiti ; (c) Pargana Samiti ; (d) Central Samiti ; and (e) Small Local Samiti. Each of these was placed in charge of a particular member. There were also inspectors, and finally a *Paridarshak* (The Visitor). Detailed rules and regulations were laid down for the setting up of new *Samitis* and their guidance. There was clearly an attempt to create something like a military organization with hard and fast rules and unquestioning obedience to leaders. The rules also laid great stress on the necessity of multiplying the societies, and finally gave reasons why Muslims were to be excluded from it.[6a] The work of the revolutionary party was divided into two broad classes: (a) General, and (b) Special. The general work was organization, propaganda, and agitation. The special work included seven kinds of work each of which is described in detail. These included, among others, the following :—(i) Preparation of explosives ; (ii) Imposing taxes on rich people with the aid of the terrorist department,—in other words, forcible collection of money by dacoity or other terrorist methods ; (iii) Inflicting the punishment of death upon members for refusing to obey orders of superior authorities. It is to be noted that among the papers found there was a document containing an exposition of Russian revolutionary methods. It gives an account of the revolution going on in Russia for fifty years and sets forth the function of the terrorist department of the Russian revoultionaries which includes dacoities as well as assassinations.

The different branches were to be organized in such a

manner that each should be self-contained. Persons working in one department ought not even to know what was being done by any other department, and in no case should one control the directions of two branches. There were, in addition, a number of detailed rules and regulations for the different types of *Samitis* into which it is not necessary to enter here. On the whole, an attempt was made to develop strict military habits among the members. There were also very efficient but secret arrangements for sending letters and communications, and a regular system of spies and counter-spies. Attention may, however, be drawn to the following rule:

"Every member shall have the idea present in his mind that he is bringing about a revolution with a view to the establishment of righteousness and not for enjoyment. He shall see that he does not fall back from this idea." This shows the high moral principle by which the revolutionary movement was inspired.

The two most important parts of the organization were recruitment of new members and arrangement for training them.

As noted above, the branches of the *Samiti* were spread all over Bengal. The Sedition Committee (P. 105) observes: "While its organisation was most compact in Mymensingh and Dacca, it was active from Dinajpur in the north-west to Chittagong in the south-east and from Cooch Behar on the north-east to Midnapore on the south-west. Outside Bengal we find its members working in Assam, Bihar, the Punjab, the United Provinces, the Central Provinces, and at Poona". The various branches in Bengal were the chief recruiting centres.

Apart from individual persuasion the two most effective fields of recruitment were the National Schools and the Volunteer Associations organized for relief works during flood or famine, or on the occasions of bath-festivals, etc.

For the purpose of training its members, the *Anusilan Samiti* had two farms at Belonia and Udaipur in Hill Tipperah. These were outwardly, and in part really, agricultural farms, but they served mainly as centres for traiining. During day time the members worked as labourrers in the fields but at night they were given training in the use of different kinds of arms, and

practised shooting in the neighbouring hills. They had to work hard and lived under strict military discipline.

An idea of the rapid development of the *Anusilan Samiti* may be obtained from the following observations of the D.I.G. (Police), Bengal in 1909.

As compared with the *Anusilan Samiti* of Calcutta, "the Dacca Anusilan Samiti was more rapid in its advance, more business-like in its organization, and more daring in its deeds, perhaps owing to the fact that the young Bengali of E.B. and Assam is generally ahead of the young Bengali of this province in natural audacity ano physical courage."

On his return from deportation Pulin Das is reported to have informed Mr. Denham of the Intelligence Branch "that he had 1,000 members in Dacca town and between 20,000 and 30,000 members in various districts of East Bengal". The Samiti had about 600 Branches.[6]

C. Activities.

The most important activities were the collection of arms, murder of obnoxious officials, and political dacoities. All these three were more or less connected. In the course of the collection of arms, necessity was felt for removing certain officials, particularly of the police department, who somehow or other got into the secret of the *Samiti*. This would occasionally involve arrest and imprisonment of the members leading to trials in open courts. In order to bear the expenses, not only of the collection of arms, but also for making proper arrangements for the accused in the law courts, it was necessary to collect money, and the only way left to the *Samiti* for this purpose was to commit dacoities in the houses of the rich. We shall give some instances of each of these activities which are illustrative in character, but by no means exhaustive.

1. Collection of Arms

Among the means adopted to collect arms we may refer to the following which are vouched for by the persons who were actually connected with the operation.

(a) There was a Kabuli (inhabitant of Afghanistan) who was a member of an organization for smuggling cocaine. Its

activities extended from Turkey, through Arabia, Persia, and Afghanistan, to the whole of India as far as Assam: It carried goods and communications through men moving in different railway stations, disguised as beggars, lame, blind etc. It is with the help of this organization and through this Kabuli that revolvers, pistols and cartridges were purchased.

(b) Another source of supply was the body of sailors in a foreign vessel. After receiving the price the sailors deposited the arms in the houses of some prostitutes at Kidderpore, as arranged beforehand. Some Anglo-Indians of the Licence Department also helped in thus securing arms.

(c) Some Hindustani mechanics, employed in the Fort William and also by Manton & Co., helped in repairing pistols, revolvers etc.

The most famous case of collecting arms was the removal, on August 26, 1914, of ten packing cases containing 50 Mauser pistols and 46,000 rounds of cartridges which came in a ship for Messrs. Rodda & Co., a firm in Calcutta which sold fire-arms. A revolutionary named Srish Mitra (Habu) had secured an employment in this Company as Custom's Sircar and ingratiated himself into the favour of the authorities. He was deputed to take delivery of the packing cases frfom the dock. In the course of doing so, he disappeared with ten of these cases. The pistols found therein were immediately distributed among nine different revolutionary groups. These stolen pistols are known to have been used in many dacoities and murders.[6c]

On November 28, 1912, a considerable quantity of arms were found in a box of Girindra Das, son of a District Magistrate in Dacca who opened the box on suspicion and informed the police. A quantity of armaments looted by the dacoits at Langalbund were also found in the same box. In November, 1913, a factory for manufacturing bombs was discovered at Rajabazar.

2. Murder of Officials and Spies

It is not always easy to ascertain definitely the particular organization which was responsible for murdering any official or committing any dacoity. So, only a general list of the more

important among these, arranged chronologically, is given below, excluding those mentioned above.

1908. November, 9.	An attempt was made on the life of Sir Andrew Fraser, the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, in the Overtun Hall, Calcutta. Sir Andrew was not wounded.
November, 9.	Sub-Inspector Nanda Lal Banerji was killed at Serpentine Lane, Calcutta.
November, 14.	Sukumar Chakravarti was killed at Ramna, Dacca ; Keshab Chandra Das was murdered at Howrah, and Annada Ghose at Ramna, Dacca. All these three were suspeced to be informers of the Police.
1909. February, 10.	The Public Prosecutor Ashutosh Biswas was shot deat at Alipore.
June, 3.	Priyanath Chatterji was killed by a pistol shot. He was evidently mistaken for his brother Ganesh, who was suspected to be an informer. Biren Ganguli, a spy, was murdered at Dacca.
1910. January, 24.	Shamsul Alam, Deputy-Superintendent of Police was shot dead by Birendranath Dutta Gupta. Ramdas, a spy, was murdered.
1911. February, 21	Srish Chandra Chakrivarti, Head Constable in the C.I.D. Department, was murdered.
April, 10	Murder of Manmohan De
June, 19.	Sub-Inspector Raj Kumar Roy was murdered in the town of Mymensingh.
July, 11.	Three persons suspected as informers were killed at village Sonarang in the district of Dacca.
December, 11.	Manmohan Ghosh, Police Inspector, who gave evidence in the Dacca Conspiracy case, was murdered at Barisal.
1912. June.	Sarada Chakravarti was killed at Feni, probably as a measure of disciplinary action, as he betrayed the Dacca Samiti.
September, 24.	Constable Ratilal Roy was murdered in Dacca.
1913 March, 27.	An attempt was made to murder Mr. Gordon at Maulvi Bazar, Sylhet, but the bomb burst and killed one of the revolutionaries.

May. A Chaprasi was killed by a bomb at Lahore which was aimed at Gordon.

September, 29. Head-Constable Hari Pada Dev was murdered at College Square, Calcutta.

September, 30. Inspector Bankim Chandra Chaudhuri was murdered at Mymensingh.

Two spies, Devendra Kumar Ghosh and Basanta Bhattacharya, were murdered.

1914

June, 19. Nripendra Ghosh, Inspector of C.I.D. Department was murdered at Chitpore Road, Calcutta.

Satyendra Sen was murdered at Chittagong on suspicion that he was an informer.

July, 19. Ram Das alias Umesh Dey was murdered at Dacca as he was helping the police against the revolutionaries.

November, 25. Bombs were thrown at the residence of Deputy-Superintendent of Police, Basanta Chattopadhyaya. Basanta was not hurt, but one Head-Constable, two Constables, and another person were injured.

1915

February, 16. An attempt was made to murder Rai Saheb Nanda Kumar Basu. He was saved but his orderly was injured.

February, 24. Nirode Haldar, who recognised the revolutionary leader, Jatin Mukherji, was shot dead.

February, 28. Police Inspector, Suresh Mukherji, was murdered Calcutta, while proceeding to arrest some revolutionaries.

March, 3. The Headmaster of Comilla Zilla School was murdered.

August, 25. Murari Mitra was murdered as he helped the police in a dacoity case.

October, 19. Jatindra Mohan Ghose, Deputy-Superintendent of Police, was murdered in Mymensingh. His young son on his lap was also killed.

October, 21. Police Sub-Inspector, Girindra Banerji, was killed and Sub-Inspector, Upendra Chatterji, was injured at Masjid Bari Street, Calcutta.

November, 30. A Constable and another person were killed at Serpentine Lane, Calcutta.

December, 19. Dhirendra Biswas, an informer, was shot dead at Bajitpur, Mymensingh.

1916 Sasi Chakravarti was killed at Bajitpur.

January, 15. Besides the above, two informers—one of whom was the Headmaster, of Maldaha Zella School—were killed.

January, 16. Sub-Inspector Madhu Sudan Bhattacharyya was shot dead before Medical College, Calcutta.

June, 23. Two Constables of C.I.D. were killed.

1916 Deputy Superintendent, Basanta Chattopadhyaya,

January, 30. and a Head-Constable were shot dead in broad daylight near the Presidency General Hospital (now called Karnani Hospital) in South Calcutta.

January. Revati Nag was killed at Sirajgunj and an attempt was made on the life of Jnan Bhaumik, a revolutionary, on suspicion that he supplied information to the police.

3. Dacoities.

Two unsuccessful attempts to commit dacoities were made in 1906 at Mahipur (Rangpur) and Sekharnagar (Dacca). On 6 December, 1907 a dacoity was committes at Chmgripota (24 Parganas) and money was taken by breaking an iron chest. Dacoities were committed in 1908 at Harinapara (Howrah), Bhojeshwar (Dacca), Gopalpur (Maldah) and Morshal (Hooghly).

The most important of the dacoities which created a sensation at the time was that committed at a village called Barha, in Dacca District, on 5 or 2 June, 1908. About 30 or 31 persons went in boats to the village and attacked the house of a rich man. A substantial amount was collected, but the dacoits met with organized opposition from the villagers. As the dacoits were returning in their boats along a river, the villagers followed them on both the banks. Meanwhile the police launch, attracted by the big crowd and tumult, appeared on the scene and there was exchange of shots between the police and the dacoits. In order to avoid the launch the dacoits took their boats in a narrow channel

and the police launch, too big to pass through it, blocked its mouth. In the evening there was a great storm and, taking advantage of it as well as of the darkness of the night, the dacoits dashed with full sails out of the channel and broke through the police blockade. On account of the velocity of the wind during the storm they covered in four hours the distance normally covered in a day. The revolutionaries admitted that the story of Devi Chaudhurani, a female leader of dacoits, as told in the famous novel of Bankim Chandra, suggested this device to them. After leaving behind the police launch at a safe distance, the dacoits got down from the boats, and walked throughout the night, reaching Dacca in the morning. The few that remained advanced in a boat through a small channel, but the boat was struck aground. Then the dacoits put on the disguise of police constable and *darogas*, and forced the villagers and *chowkidars* to drag the boat for nearly half a mile over the high land. In this way they reached a safe place. The police arrested a few persons on suspicion, but they were released on the ground that they were seen in the town of Dacca on the morning, and it was impossible to reach the place within a day from the scene of the dacoity or the place where the police launch attacked the party. It is estimated that more than Rs. 25,000/- were collected by the dacoits.[7]

Another important dacoity took place at Naria on 30 October, 1908. Here, again, a large number of dacoits went by boat to a place called Naria, an important mart in the district of Faridpur. They looted a number of shops in broad daylight and retired in safety. Two men were killed. The dacoits took less than seven hundred rupees, but property worth more than six thousand was damaged. Among other dacoities committed in 1908, mention may be made of those at Bajitpur (Mymensingh), Raita (Nadia), and Dehargati (Barisal). involving, respectively Rs. 1500, 1915, and 300.

Dacoity was also committed with the help of taxis. Eighteen thousand Rupees belonging to the South India Jute Mills were being taken from Calcutta in a carriage on 12 February, 1915. The revolutionary dacoits, coming in a taxi, met the carriage at the crossing of two streets in Garden Reach, Kidderpore, a southern suburb of Calcutta They asked the

carriage to stop, took the money, and, having kept the passers by at bay through fire-arms, got into the taxi. As the taxi-driver refused to drive, he was beaten and thrown away, and one of the dacoits drove the taxi at full speed, till one of the tyres burst at Baruipur. They then hired a carriage, came to the river-side, engaged a boat which took them to Taki, and came by railway to Calcutta.

Most of the dacoities were carried on in the ordinary way. A number of armed revolutionaries, sometimes putting masks, suddenly attacked the house of a rich man, demanded money or the key of iron-safe, and if he did not willingly surrender them, forced him to do so. But it was a fixed principle that the body of a woman should never be touched. On one occasion, as soon as a member of the party stretched his hand to snatch a necklace from a lady, he was slapped by another with such force that he fell down, when a third member aimed a pistol at him. The culprit was let off with a warning, but a strict vigilance was kept upon him.

It is not necessary to refer to all the political dacoities as the number would be very large. A fairly long list is given in the report of the Sedition Committee and this is supplemented by Sri Kali Charan Ghosh in his Bengali book *Jagaran o Bish-foran,* Vol. II. A list as also given by Uma Mukherjee in *"Two Great Revolutionaries"* pp. 28-9, 33-37. Only a few cases, which either involved a large amount of money or had some distinctive features, are noted below.

YEAR 1909.

October, 11. A sum of Rs. 23,000/- was robbed from a railway train at Rajendrapur. A Durwan was killed and another injured. The money belonged to a Jute Company of Narayanganj.

November, 11 A sum of Rs. 16,400/- was robbed at Mohanpur in Tippera district.

A dacoity was committed at Rajnagar (Dacca) and Rs. 28,000 looted. At Malkhanagar (Dacca) the throats of a Postmaster and Peon were cut my razors and Rs. 1000 were taken from a house at Buikara (Jessore)

YEAR 1910

November, 30. A sum of nearly Rs. 50,000/- was robbed from Dadpur in Backergunj District. Five men were wounded.

Six thousand Rupees were robbed at Dhulgram (Jessore).

Dacoites were also committed at Nandanpur (Khulna), Mahesha (Jessore) and Kalangaon (Faridpur), the money robbed amounting, respectively, to Rs. 13,000,2500 and 12, 500.

According to the report of the Sedition Committee many of these and other dacoities were organized by the Sonarang National School Centre.

YEAR 1911

April. 22. A sum of Rs. 10,000/- was robbed from Lakshmankati in the Backergunj District.

September, 5. Rs. 7500 were robbed at Suhair (Dacca).

YEAR 1912

July, 11. The dacoits took Rs. 20,000/- from the village Panam in Dacca District. The villagers and the dacoits exchanged shots and one was killed.

November, 14. There was a dacoity at Langalbund in the district of Dacca in which Rs. 16,000/- were taken. About 200 villagers opposed the dacoits, but they were kept away by four revolutionaries with the help of their guns.

YEAR 1913

February, 4. The dacoits took more than Rs. 9,000/- from Dhuldia in the Mymensingh District. They used bombs and pistols, killing one and wounding three.

February, 4. The sum of Rs. 3,400/- taken from a house at Bharakar (Dacca).

April, 3. Rs. 6,945/- taken from Gopalpur (Faridpur), after wounding a man.

May, 29. More than 5,000 rupees robbed at Kawakuri (Faridpur).

August 16. Nearly twenty thousand rupees robbed after killing one and wounding five men. (Kedarpur Mymensing).

November, 24. Rs. 4,390 robbed at Sarachar (Mymensingh).

December, 3. Rs. 6,000 robbed at Kharampur (Tippera).

December, 19. The dacoits took Rs. 3,100 after wounding one man, from a house at Paschimsing (Tippera).

Among other dacoities the following may be mentioned with the amount robbed being shown within brackets. Baiguntewari (Dacca, Rs. 3000); Aynapur (Dacca, Rs. 7,000), Birangal (Backergunge, Rs. 8,000). The revoluiioeries, after a free fight with the villagers, robbed Rs. 7,000 at Pratabpur (Backergunge).

YEAR 1914

May, 8. The dacoits wounded one man and took Rs. 5,500 from Gossainpur (Tippera).

August, 28. The dacoits took more than Rs. 17,000/- from Bitai after killing one and wounding another.

December, 23. The dacoits took Rs. 23,000/- from Darikpur in the district of Mymensingh after wounding one.

YEAR 1915

January, 23. Rs. 50,000/- were robbed at Kurul in the district of Rangpur.

February, 12. The dacoits took Rs. 18,000/- from Garden Reach near Ca!cutta. This was the first political dacoity in which taxis were used. (See pp, 274-5).

February, 20. About 30 or 40 young men, fully armed, attacked a house at Dharail in the Rajshahi District and robbed more than Rs. 25,000/- aftfer killing the Durwan and wounding two others. The party belonged to the *Anusilan Samiti* of Dacca.

February 22. Rs. 20,000/- were taken from a rice-merchant at Belliaghata near Calcutta.

April, 30. There was a dacoity at Pragpur in the District of Nadia. The sum involved was small,—about Rs. 2,300/—but there was a free fight between the dacoits and the police in which the dacoits shot one of their own men through mistake. This was Susil Sen (p. 259) who was punished to whipping by Kingsford for having assaulted a Sergeant in course of the trial of Sri B. C. Pal. His dead body was thrown into the river. Some of the dacoits were caught, of whom three were transported for 17 years and the others for 8 years.

June, 5. Rs. 15,000/- were robbed from Ghazipur in the District of Backergunj.

June, 26. The dacoits robbed Rs. 12,500/- from a house at Gopi Roy Lane, Calcutta. A letter, written in Bengali, was sent to the owner of the house in which he was thanked, and the promise held out that as soon as India would obtain independence the whole amount would be repaid with interest. The letter was signed by "J. Balwant, Finance Secretary to the Bengal Branch of Independent Kingdom of India".

August, 14. Rs. 18,000/- were robbed at Haripur in the District of Tippera. One man was killed and three wounded by gun shots.

September, 7. Rs. 21,000/- were robbed at Chandrakona in the District of Mymensingh. One villager was killed and six wounded.

September, 30. The dacoits under the leadership of Naren Ghose secured more than Rs. 20,000/- from Shibpur in the District of Nadia. Here, also, there was a free fight between the dacoits and the police aided by the villagers. Nine dacoits were captured including the leader. Eight of these were transported for life and one for ten years.

December, 2. Rs. 25,000/- were taken by the dacoits from the Corporation Street in Calcutta.

December, 29. Fifteen to twenty thousand Rupees robbed at Karatola (Tippera).

YEAR 1916

March, 6. More than Rs. 14,000/- were robbed in the District of Tippera in which telegraph line was cut.

April, 30. Rs. 17,500/- were robbed from Natghar in Tippera District.

June, 9. Rs. 43,000/- and a gun were robbed from a house at Dhankar (Faridpur).

September, 2. A sum of Rs. 530 was robbed at Laliteswar in the district of Tippera. There was a severe fight between the dacoits and the villagers, five of whom were killed. One dacoit was killed by snake-bite.

October, 17 Rs. 80,000/- or 90,000/- were robbed at Sahildeo in the district of Mymensingh. The son of the houseowner was killed and six others wounded.

YEAR 1917

April, 15. More than Rs. 26,000/- were robbed at Jamnagar in Rajshahi District.

May, 7. The dacoits robbed a goldsmith's shop in Armenian Street, Calcutta, and took away Rs. 5,500/-. There was a free fight in course of which two men of the shop were killed and two wounded. One of the dacoits was wounded by a gun-shot. He was carried in a taxi, but as the wounds proved serious, the dacoits themselves killed him and left his dead body.

June, 25. More than Rs. 31,000/- were robbed from Rakhalburuj in Rajshahi District in which the owner of the house and his son were killed.

October, 27. The dacoits raided a house at Abdullapur in Dacca District. A Yatra (a sort of drama)

was being performed at that time in the house, and hundreds of people were assembled there. But a few dacoits threatened them with guns to keep quiet, while the rest robbed the house without any opposition. The telegraph wires were already cut. It was a very remarkable performance in the history of the political dacoity of Bengal.

November, 3. Rs. 33,000/- were robbed at Majhiara in Tippera district.

There were several free fights between the Police and the revolutionaries in 1918; one at a secluded place full of jungles near Gauhati (7 January), another at Kaltabazar, Dacca (15 April) and a third at Teligana (15 April).

The following abstract table of terrorist outrages in Bengal is drawn on the basis of the Sedition Committee's Report. But this is not a complete list as would appear from the details given above.

Year.	Bomb outrages	Murder.	Dacoity.	Miscellaneous.
1907	...	1 ...	3 ...	3 (attempted train wrecking).
1908	6 ...	9 ...	8 ...	... ...
1909	1 ...	2 ...	10 ...	1 (theft of arms).
1910	...	1 ...	7 ...	do
1911	...	6 ...	11	
1912	1 ...	3 ...	10	
1913	3 ...	6 ...	10	
1914	1 ...	3 ...	13	
1915	...	17 ...	23	
1916	...	9 ...	11	
1917	...	7 ...	6	

One of the preventive steps taken by the Government was to institute conspiracy case against a large number of young men on general charges of murder and dacoity, the two most notable being those of Dacca (1910-11) and Barisal (1913 and 1915). Large member of persons were transported and inprisoned.

II. MUTINY OF THE JAT REGIMENT

Reference may be made to a little known incident which points to a new line of revolutionary activities which were further developed later. It is a plot, probably hatched by the Bengali revolutionaries, which has been kept a profound secret by the British Government. But the records discovered in the Soviet archives give us an idea of what had actually taken place. At that time, there had been a Russian Consulate-General in Calcutta. Mr. Arsenyer, the Russian Consul-General, who had been carefully following the political situation in the country informed St. Petersburg on February 6, 1910, as follows :

"At present, despite the British authorities' desire to keep the affair from becoming public, some details have come to light, and it was beyond any doubt that the existence of a conspiracy was disclosed, and that conspiracy was connected with the liberation movement which had been gaining momentum in India in recent years.....The conspiracy was nipped in the bud."

It was only a year later, in the spring of 1911, that a belated official statement appeared in the Indian Press to the effect that 25 sepoys had been tried in a court of justice and accused of belonging to a revolutionary party. It appears that the first announcement of the arrest of 10 soldiers had been wrong. Consul Arsenyev named as many as 35 and even 42 sepoys on trial. In his letter of March 11, 1911, the Russian diplomat stressed that the British colonial authorities had weighty reasons for hushing up the case.

During the Christmas holidays in 1909, a ball was to be held at the residence of the Bengal Governor to which the Viceroy, Commander-in-Chief and all the high-ranking officers and officials of Calcutta were to be invited. The 10th Jat Regiment was to do sentry duty during the ball. The undercover patriotic organisation which had established contact with the soldiers decided to take advantage of this convenient ball to blow up the ballroom and thus destroy the colonial Government. As the Consul wrote, it had been intended to "arouse in the country a general perturbation of minds and thereby afford the revolutionaries an opportunity to take the power in their hands."

The police had suspected nothing, and it is hard to say what

the outcome would have been had the soldiers not been betrayed by one of their comrades who informed the authorities about the impending coup.

The fact that this conspiracy originated at a time when the national liberation movement of 1905-1908 was being crushed—to wit, the trial and incarceration of Tilak and the uprisings which followed—is of great historical importance.

As the time passed, certain information found its way into the Press on the conspirators' trial. Basing itself on information gathered from a foreign newspaper, the Russian paper *Zemshchina* wrote that the sepoys had conducted themselves with great poise at the trial. They declared that they had joined a revolutionary union set up by Bengali patriots, and were aware of the fact that this union wanted to overthrow British rule in India. They declared that they had taken an oath of allegiance to maintain unity and were duty-bound to help conduct revolutionary agitation among the troops. One of the accused told the judge: Don't think there are only 25 such sepoys. Oh no! There are many such sepoys, and the fate of British domination in India is in our hands !"

The English court imposed severe penalties upon the arrested soldiers.[7]

III. EARLY REVOLUTIONARY ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE BENGAL

The activities of the *Anusilan Samiti* were not confined to Bengal. Its members tried to create revolutionary centres all over India, and definite evidence is available regarding their work in Assam, Bihar, the Punjab, the United Provinces, the Central Provinces and Bombay.

From the materials at our disposal, it is not possible to give a connected and systematic account of all these activities, nor is it easy, in all cases, to distinguish them from those of other revolutionary groups who worked independently or in co-operation with them. It would be convenient, therefore, to sketch the principal lines of revolutionary activities, specifying the names of different organizations whenever we can do so on sure grounds.

A. BIHAR AND ORISSA

An official Report[8] gives a detailed account of the revolutionary activities in Patna, Deoghar, Dumka and other places in Bihar, and refers briefly to those in Banaras and Allahabad. Most of the revolutionaries dealt with came from Bengal; many of them belonged to the *Anusilan Samiti*, though other organizations were also represented. It is not possible, within the limited space at our disposal, even to give a brief summary of the various incidents mentioned in the Report. Suffice it to say that the revolutionary activities were similar to those mentioned above, including dacoities, murder of officials, and collection of arms, and were carried on by individual members and groups, sometimes in close co-operation with different revolutionary organizations in Bengal. The intimate relation between them is proved by the correspondence intercepted by the police as well as the activities of Baidynath Biswas of Dumka and his associate Prabhudayal Marwari, among others. Regarding these two we find the following note in the Report.

"Baidyanath Biswas eventually made a very detailed statement of his complicity in, and knowledge of, various branches of the revolutionary conspiracy. He spoke of his connection with Bipin Ganguli's gang, which had first come to notice some time before the arms theft, which its members committed; the Pabna party under Abinash Ray and Jatin Hui; the Barisal parties under Narendra Mohan Ghosh Chaudhury (transported for life in the Sibpur and concerned in the Jaipur dacoity); Jatin Mukherji's notorious gang; the Garden Reach, Beliaghata and Agarpara taxicab dacoities; his association with Phani Chakravarti and Atul Ghosh of the gun-running conspiracy; the handing over of 26 of the stolen pistols to Jadugopa' Mukherji,[9] one of the most dangerous and active members of the conspiracy; and much else of which he had either personal or second-hand knowledge." (He described his first meeting with Bipin Ganguli who used to train a number of young recruits to the revolutionary party, and the whole history of the theft of arms and ammunition from Rodda's mentioned on p. 270).

"Prabhu Dayal, he said, was a member of the main Calcutta gang. He had known him since his boyhood. From 1907 to

1909 Prabhu had studied at the Tej Narain Jubilee College, Bhagalpur, and had met Bipin Ganguli there. Later on, in Calcutta, Prabhu had introduced him (Baidynath) to Bipin. Prabhu was not fully trusted by the gang, as he was a Marwari, but had been a willing worker and had rendered active service in connection with the hiding of the arms stolen from Rodda's and had also given financial assistance once when Bipin Ganguli was prosecuted in connection with the Agarpara dacoity.

"Enquiries into Prabhu Dayal's case showed that in addition to what has already been noted, he had fitted Baidyanath out as a Marwari when the latter, then at Dumka, learning of the searches in connection with the arms theft, suddenly left for Calcutta. Prativa Dutta, who was obviously in the know,- had been present when Baidynath was fitted out as a Marwari, and had seen a copy of "Anarchy and Anarchists" in Prabhu's possession. This is a work on anarchism in Russia, Germany and elsewhere and contains formulae for bombs. etc."

The Report gives a large number of instances showing close connection between Bengal revolutionaries and those in Bihar and some places outside it. It also gives a detailed account of a dacoity committed at Chainpur, near Jajpur, Cuttack, "by a gang of 17 young men who used whistles, *patakas*, hammers, knives, gas lamps etc.—all the usual paraphernalia of a typical Bengali Bhadralog gang." The telegraph wires were cut and so perfect was the arrangement made beforehand that all of them escaped by Railway trains with the exception of one, Debendra Chandra Chaudhuri, who was closely connected with various revolutionary groups in Bengal. He said later, that his arrest at Kharagpur was pre-arranged in order to give the remaining sixteen chances to escape.

One member of the party who committed the dacoity was Lakhi Dhar, an inhabitant of Gurudaspur, P.S. Jajpur, in Orissa. His case gives us some idea of the manner in which revolutionary ideas were spread outside Bengal. As this may be regarded as a typical one, we quote the following extract from the Report based on the confession of Lakhi Dhar.

"He went to Calcutta to study in 1912 and used to take his meals at the house of Dr. Gyanendra Nath Mitra at 103 Cornwallis Street. He met Suresh Dhar there and Suresh often

talked to him on political matters and gave him books to read, such as Bankim Chandra's *Anandamath* and literature about the Mutiny, and how the English secured possession of India. He was introduced to Manindra Chaudhuri at 41, Mirzapur Street. In 1913 Manindra initiated him, taking blood from Suresh Dhar's left hand and smearing it on his own, Suresh's and Lakhi Dhar's foreheads, and made him take a vow of seerecy and obedience. Once in 1914 he was ordered to remain in his lodging in case he was wanted, and later on Suresh asked him to find another Oriya. He gave him the name of Basua Barik, who was working for Dr. Mitra."

A similar instance of recruiting is also described in the same Report in connection with the famous Bengali revolutionary leader, Sachindra Sanyal, who was working from Banaras centre. As it throws interesting light on the growth and development of new rsevolutionary centres, outside Bengal, we may quote the following extensive extract based mainly upon the confession of one Bankim Chandra Mitra, a resident of Patna.

"According to his version he had, during the previous Puja vacation, gone to Moghulsarai and stayed with his brother, Surendra Nath Mitra, who was in railway employ there. From Moghulsarai he had gone on to Benaras and had come across Sachindra Nath Sanyal at Dasasvamedh Ghat. Sachindra asked him where he had come from, and got into conversation with him. He asked him whether he had read Vivekananda's books and advised him to read more and Sachindra offered to lend him some. Sachindra also gave him a lecture on the "Immortality of the Soul", and pointed out that death was merely a change from one state to another. He said that if one could realize that the soul was immortal one could dare anything. Sachindra took both the Moghulsarai and Bankipur addresses of Bankim. In the course of conversation he pointed out how the country had fallen and how other countries had gained their independence. He told Bankim his name was Sachindra, but gave him no address. The next day at about 3 p.m. Sachindra went to Moghulsarai to see Bankim and gave him the *Life of Mazzini* and told him to read it carefully. He also said that when he (Bankim) would prove himself worthy,

he would admit him into their Society. He would test him before entrusting him with more imporant work. Bankim asked him how many persons belonged to his Society and was informed, about 1,000 or 2,000. Bankim had been to Benaras several times and on one occasion took Akhil Das Gupta with him. They both went to Bindhyachal, where Akhil had lived at the house of Parvati Chandra Ghosh.

"In the third week of November a Bengali youth, named Birendra Nath, called to see Bankim at the Bihar National College and took him towards the Ganges. He asked him if he knew Sachindra and at Bankim's answer in the affirmative, said he had come from him. On Bankim asking him what he wanted, Birendra showed him some *Yugantar* leaflets and asked him to post them up in prominent places. Bankim refused to do this, whereupon Birendra got annoyed and taunted him. Birendra then asked that if Bankim refused to do this, he might at least give him the names of persons to whom he could send the leaflets, and tell him the prominent places where he could post them up. Bankim supplied him with some names. Birendra who was known as "Raibik Biren", was never traced.

"Sachindra had advised Bankim to start local societies, where books and papers could be read and instructions given. On his return to Bankipur, Bankim discussed the subject of starting a society with Paresh Nath Sinha, Second Year student, Bihar National College, living near Khuda Buksh Library. Paresh Nath had read many of Vivekananda's works and it was his idea that a society to be called "The Hindu Boys' Association" should be started. The organizers of this society were Bankim, Paresh, Gobardhan Lal, Shyama Kanta Banerji and Akhil Das Gupta. Paresh Nath's idea in starting the society was that Bihari boys could not understand Bengali at the *Hari Sabha,* but at meetings of the Hindu Boys' Association, both Hindu-Biharis and Bengalis might discuss Vivekananda's works and teachings in English. Bankim said this association had not actually got going.

"Bankim's statements and the enquiries made in the United Provinces and at Bankipur showed that there was a very active revolutionary organization at Benaras, and that they were starting a branch of it at Bankipur, the object being to enlist Biharis in

the cause, Bankipur with its colleges offering a fair field for recruitment. Enquiries were made regarding all Bankim's associates but nothing definite could be proved against any of them. He was himself dismissed from the Bihar National College and was given shelter by Professor Jadu Nath of Patna College, to whose sons he became a tutor. For some time, however, nothing happened, but later on seditious leaflets periodically began to make their appearance in Patna and Bankipur. The enquiries that were made from time to time seemed to show that some one at Benaras was responsible or at any rate directing affairs. It may be noted here that Bibhuti Bhusan Haldar's revelations and the doings of the Chandernagore gang in the Government Press did not come to light till later. Secret information of a conspiracy to steal a revolver belonging to Babu Dhirakshan Singh. Deputy Magistrate, Bankipur, was received, and Ram Kishun Pathak, an associate of Bankim's, was said to have been approached about it; no actual attempt however was made and the incident was lost sight of till later on. In August 1915, at the search of he house of Jitendra Sanyal, brother of Sachindra Sanyal, the arch-conspirator of the Benaras gang, a new and till then unpublished edition of the *Swadhin Bharat* leaflet was found, with a list of 30 residents of Patna and Bankipur. This list was believed to be in Bankim's handwriting, and on this and the evidence of Bibhuti Haldar, who was made an approver in the Benaras conspiracy case and had mentioned Bankim as a conspirator who was in touch with Sachindra Sanyal, Bankim was included in the Benaras conspiracy case and was arrested on 6th September, and sent to Benaras where he was tried and eventually convicted under section 121-A, I. P. C. and sentenced to three years' rigorous imprisonment."

B. THE PANJAB

No detailed and authentic information is available regarding the beginning of revolutionary activities in the Panjab. But a very brief autobiographical memoir of Sri J. M. Chatterji throws some interesting light on the question. Sri Chatterji was a Bengali, but his family was settled in Shaharanpur as far back as 1875. According to him the revolutionary urge reached this

distant corner of Northern India and a few young men, including Chatterji, formed a secret society as early as 1904. They took a solemn oath on the banks of a stream, known as Dhamola, in Shaharanpur District, to lay down their lives in the struggle for the independence of the country. Their plans and methods of work followed the usual lines. Soon the headquarters were shifted to Roorkee and new recruits were collected, chiefly from the Engineering College. They were soon joined by Hardayal, Ajit Singh and Sufi Ambaprasad. The Partition of Bengal and the *Swadeshi* movement gave a great impetus to their activities, and they kept a close contact with Bengal revolutionaries through Srish Chandra Ghosh, Chandra Kanta and others. They worked under the inspiring leadership of Hardayal and the revolutionary spirit was widely spread over the Panjab. Lala Lajpat Rai helped them a great deal, though, like Tilak, he concentrated his activities in Congress work, as a leading member of the Congress Party. As usual, secret arrangements were made for collecting arms and manufacturing bombs. Ajit Singh, in collaboration with Amba Prasad, widely distributed a number of revolutionary publications. Amba Prasad was the *de facto* editor of a number of vernacular papers like *Swaraj* of Allahabad and *Jhang Siyal* of Jhang.

Some idea of the revolutionary activities in the Panjab has been given above.[10]

According to the official view, the Arya Samaj was chiefly responsible for sedition in the Panjab. Among those implicated in seditious movement in the year 1907 were many members of the Arya Samaj, and Sir Denzil Ibbetson, according to a report in the *Tribune,* had been informed by nearly every District Magistrate of the Panjab that wherever there was an Arya Samaj it was the centre of seditious talk. But the Arya Samaj itself publicly disowned any connection with any political agitation in any shape by passing a resolution to that effect. Michael O'Dwyer, however, says "that an enormous proportion of the Hindus convicted of sedition and other political offences from 1907 down to the present day (1925) are members of the Samaj".[11]

Lajpat Rai and Ajit Singh, who were deported, were released after six months. For some time things were quiet, but the re

volutionary activity in the Panjab flared up again in 1909. Seditious literature was circulated and Ajit Singh, who was suspected in this connection, fled to Persia. A copy of the bomb-manual used by the group of Barin Ghosh of Calcutta was found in the possession of Bhai Paramanand.

According to Government version Lala Hardayal was chiefly responsible for the recrudescence of sedition. He had returned to India in 1908 and "held a class in Lahore, preaching the bringing of an end of the British Government by a general boycott combined with passive resistance of every kind."

After Hardayal left India, the work was carried on by his two pupils, J. M. Chatterji, a Bengali, and Dinanath, an up-country Hindu—who were joined by Amir Chand of Delhi. Chatterji, too, shortly afterwards, proceeded to England, but, before leaving, introduced Dinanath to Rash Behari Bose, a clerk of the Forest Research Institute of Dehra Dun, who proved to be a great revolutionary leader. He gathered round him a number of other devoted pupils such as Avadh Bihari and Bal Mukund, and their main activities were dissemination of seditious literature printed in Bengal and training for the preparation of bombs. The first great overt act of this group was the throwing of a bomb at Lord Hardinge in December, 1912. A bomb was also placed on a road in the Lawrence Gardens on May 17, 1913, and was probably meant for some Europeans. But it actually killed an Indian orderly. The subsequent history of this group will be related later.

C. MAHARASHTRA

Reference has been made above[12] to the beginnings of revolutionary activities in Bombay. Its first two phases were dominated, respectively, by Wasudeo Balwant Phadke and the Chapekar brothers. The third phase centres round the towering personality of Vinayak Damodar Savarkar. His early activities, up to the foundation of the revolutionary Association named *Abhinava Bharat* in 1904, has been described above.[13] Although Savarkar himself proceeded to London in 1906, his organization continued to flourish in India. It seriously took up the revolutionary actiivties and tried to

19V2

spread its branches all over Maharashtra. It arranged meetings, small publications, processions, celebrations of Ganapati and Shivaji festivals, etc. It preached the gospel of freedom and sang songs and ballads of freedom, the refrain of which was "Free India from the foreigners' yoke". The life of Mazzini was translated by Savarkar in Marathi, of which 2000 copies were sold in three months. The *Abhinava Bharat* held periodical meetings, in which discourses were held about the social, political, and economic condition of India, and history of countries which secured their independence by armed revolution. The members were trained in drill and martial exercises, including sword and *lathi* plays, riding, swimming, mountain climbing, 20 miles race, etc. There was at that time a network of secret societies all over the country. Many colleges and higher educational institutions in Poona and Bombay had at least one secret society or branch of the *Abhinava Bharat*. The young men, thus saturated with revolutionary ideas, went away after completing their education and became the leaders in their own towns and cities and started the branches of *Abhinava Bharat* or new secret societies in Maharashtra, Carnatic and Madhya Pradesh. Members of the *Abhinava Bharat* held important posts in Government services in all the three zones and some even in the Secretariat at Delhi. The Society held an annual meeting in a secret place in which the leaders reported the activities of their branches and the total number of members in them. The Society also established contact with Bengal.

The Society's activities included collection of, and training in, arms and explosives wherever and whenever possible. It collected a stock of old arms, such as swords, daggers, spears and a few fire-arms. Arms were also surreptitiously sent from London by Savarkar when he settled there in 1906. He sent a number of Browning pistols to India with Mirza Abbas, Sikandar Hayat and several others. Chaturbhuj[13a] brought 20 of them in a false-bottom box and successfully evaded the vigilance of the customs authorities. Mr. Parker of the Scotland Yard stated in the course of his deposition in the Nasik Conspiracy case that hundreds of such pistols were purchased by Indians in England and on the Continent. A member of the Society, Mr. P. N. Bapat, was sent to Paris to learn the art of bomb-making from

Russian revolutionaries. He worked along with Hem Chandra Das and Mirza Abbas who were also there for the same purpose. They secured a copy of Russian book on the method of preparing bombs, and this bomb-manual was translated in English. Cyclostyled copies of this book were brought to India and many were trained in bomb-making. It is interesting to note that one copy of this bomb-manual was given to Tilak.

In addition to *Abhinava Bharat* many other secret societies sprang up in different parts of Maharashtra, early in the twentieth century. Most of them worked independently of, and even unknown to, one another, though the aims, objects and methods were more or less similar. This was mainly due to a very natural desire to maintain secrecy. The *Abhinava Bharat* came into direct contact with a large number of such independent secret societies working in a parallel line at Bombay, Poona, Nasik, Kolhapur, Aund, Satara, Gwalior, Baroda, Amraoti, Yeotmal, Nagpur, and many other places. In Poona three groups, including the Khare group, were working separately and unknown to each other. Even at Nasik Karve and Dharap groups were working separately. Baroda and Gwalior had not only branches of *Abhinava Bharat*, but also other secret societies. Many secret societies concentrated their main effort on the manufacture of bombs. As noted above, a manual describing the method of preparing bombs was cyclostyled and circulated in large number. Factories for manufacturing bombs or bomb-materials were started at Nasik, Bombay, Poona, Kothura, Pen, Aundh Khanapur, Basai and at many other places. Basai or Bassein was the chief centre where bombs and other explosives were produced on a large scale. We have a very detailed and interesting account of the manufacture of bombs at Basai, from the pen of Mr. R. D. Bhat and also from K. G. Khare, In Poona alone there were three groups making bombs, namely, (1) Khare's group, (2) Kolhapur group and (3) Mahajan's group.

Other revolutionary activities were also contemplated. Karve travelled on foot through Bhorghat and marked out points on the railway track in order to destroy the special train carrying high officials. For this pupose they devised the clock-work devices by which the bomb could be made to explode at any

particular time. When, in 1908, Tilak was sentenced to 6 years' transportation, the young revolutionaries were aflame with excitement and indignation. They learnt how to shoot with rifles and revolvers, and were trained in all kinds of revolutionary activities. N. S. Gokhale gives a very interesting account of Damodar Joshi and others who decided to manufacture bombs on a large scale and started a factory at Kolhapur. An accidental explosion led to the discovery of the whole plot and the authorities, who arrested a large number of persons, started the Kolhapur Bomb case, as a result of which a number of revolutionaries was sentenced to long terms of imprisonment.

The Karve group at Nasik plotted the murder of Mr. Jackson, District Magistrate of Nasik, because he had let off Mr. Williams, an Engineer, who had killed a farmer by rash and negligent driving. Jackson was on order of transfer, and a dramatic performance was held on the night of 21st December, 1909, as a part of his farewell ceremonial. Three revolutionaries went to the theatre, each armed with a revolver. When Jackson arrived at the gate, he was shot dead by Anant Lakshman Kanhere, who was specially cautioned by Karve to commit suicide, if he could not escape, in order to avoid being forced to make any confession. Unfortunately, Anant failed to do this and instead made a bold statement giving out his own real name and address. As a result of this the police found out the leading members of the secret societies. In order to avoid detection, the secret societies destroyed the bombs and materials for preparing them, and the stores in the Basai factory, including some ready-made bombs, were thrown into the sea. Practically this was the end of this sort of revolutionary activities in Maharashtra, at least for the time being.

It is interesting to note in this connection that the Maharashtra revolutioneries at one time proposed to murder the great political leader, G. K. Gokhale, for his alleged animosity against Tilak. Gokhale refused to preside over a meeting in London, where he then was, for protesting against the incarceration of Tilak. Gokhale told Morley, the Secretary of State, that "Tilak had great connection with Savakar and Bapat". This was found by surreptitiously securing a copy of the telegram from the Telegraph Office. Some revolutionaries regarded Gokhale's

action as treachery, and some members from the Poona group intended to murder him, but others felt that Gokhale fell a prey to Morley's guiles, and so no action was ultimately taken against him.

The secret societies keenly felt he need of funds to carry on their activities. They received small subscriptons, but these were not sufficient for the heavy expenses necessary for carrying on the manufacture of bombs on a large scale. It is said that Patankar, who had to supply funds for the Basai bomb centre, had on one occasion actually to sell his wife's gold ornaments for purchasing materials for manufacturing bombs. One gentleman promised Mr. Karve Rs. 10,000/- if Judge Davar, who sentenced Tilak to imprisonment, was murdered. But though several attempts were made, none of them was successful, and so he did not get this sum. Being thus desperate, his followers committed some petty thefts to raise money for manufacturing explosives. But the idea was given up as they did not like to commit thefts and dacoities on their own countrymen. Some rich merchants and some princes promised money to the secret societies if they could show some heroic deeds (murders of some British officers and traitors). But unfortunately these could not be arranged without sufficient funds. One revolutionary comments on this situation as follows: "We were thus in a dilemma; no money without brave deeds, and no brave deeds without money; and this dilemma was never solved till our organization was liquidated in 1910." To overcome the difficulties about the funds the secret societies tried to ensure free supply of arms by converting the army and the police to their views, but this also did not prove successful. Commenting on the difficulty of securing funds, Dr. V. M. Bhat says in his memoir that Bengal revolutionaries were forced to commit dacoities when they were driven to this position. But he disapproves of this course, as in his opinion it leads to premature disclosure of the activities of the secret societies and enables the Government to suppress them. He blames Karve for shooting Mr. Jackson on these grounds and makes the following statement:

"I told Karve that we had settled at Surat a joint programme with the Bengal revolutionaries of simultaneous murders of English officials in at least three provinces, and blowing up

the bridges and railways and Government offices. He agreed with the plan and promised me, swearing by his Guru's name, not to precipitate matters by any impassionate action on the part of his group".

This charge against Karve was very strongly resented and repudiated by Khare in his statement. Bhat also blames the Bengal revolutionaries for the dacoities committed by them, and comments as follows:

"This led them to abandon concerted plan hatched at Surat and that marred all our prospects of conjoint action. Hem Chandra Das had confessed this to Bapat, but it was too late to mend matters. They had taken to commit dacoities and were exposed before they were ready."

Although Shri Bhat expressed himself very strongly against political dacoities, Nana Sahib Gokhale, in his account of the Shivaji Club at Kolhapur, observes: "Its members began to preach that they should follow Shri Shivaji's methods in the preliminary work for liberating their country; this resulted in committing dacoities." He, however, does not give any details.

D. OTHER REGIONS

The revolutionary organizations in Bengal, Bihar, Panjab and Maharashtra have been noted above in some detail. But although such a detailed knowledge about organization is lacking, revolutionary activities may be traced in other parts of India also. A few notable instances are given below.

1. RÀJASTHAN

A revolutionary organization grew up in Rajasthan in imitation of Bengal shortly after the Partition of Bengal. The nationalist ideas, specially educational and social reforms, were preached in the early nineties of the nineteenth century, and three persons took the lead. These were Arjun Lal Sethi, Barhat Keshari Singh, and Rao Gopal Singh. As usual, they began as reformers and ended as revolutionaries. This was mainly due to the influence of Shyamji Krishnavarma, Arabinda, and Tilak with whom they came into conact. Rao Gopal Singh

visited Calcutta and came into contact with he Bengal revolutionaries. Arjun Lal was intimately associated with notable revolutionaries like Amir Chand, Avadh Bihari, and Bal Mukund, and one Bishnu Dutt was the connecting link between them. Gradually the revolutionary organization spread to different parts of Rajasthan. It provided secure shelter to revolutionaries from British India, and two members of Sachindra Sanyal's organization were sent from Banaras to Kharwa to prepare bombs. Two other Bengali revolutionaries found shelter with the Thakur of Kuchaman between 1908 and 1911.

By the year 1911 a number of yonug men joined the revolutionary organization and some of them were sent to Delhi for training under Amir Chand, Avadh Bihari, and Bal Mukund. The most famous among these young workers was Pratap Singh, son of Barhat Keshari Singh, who played an important part in the various conspiracies organized by Rash Behari Bose. He died a martyr's death and showed unflinching courage and exemplary endurance.

Among the overt activities of this revolutionary group was the murder of Jodhpur *Mohan* in June 1912. This was organized by Barhat Keshari Singh with a view to securing money for revolutionary purposes. The Sadhu was brought to a Boarding house at Kotch on false pretence and killed by poisoned milk.

The second murder was arranged by the group of Arjun Lal Sethi. Arjun Lal laid the foundation of the Jain Educational Society in India and set up an educational institution called Shri Vardhaman Jain Vidyalaya at Jaipur. Arjun Lal's school was mainly religious, but the visits and lectures of one Bishnu Dutt, a native of the Mirzapur District, U. P., introduced political and even revolutionary ideas. He pointed out to the students the present deplorable condition of India and held up before them the ideals of revolutionaries in Bengal. He also taught them that the committing of dacoity was necessary to attain *Swaraj,* as it would enable them to procure revolvers and pistols. Three students of this school, named Moti Chand, Manik Chand and Jai Chand were induced by him to translate the theory into pratice, and under the leadership of Bishnu Dutt they killed a Hindu *Mohant* who looked after a small temple

at Nimez in Bihar. But, unfortunately, they could not open the iron safe and secure any money. This happened on March 20, 1913.

2. VARANASI (BANARAS)

Banaras was also a great centre of revolutionary activities and an account of it has already been given in connection with the history of Sachindra Sanyal,[13b] The Baranasi Conspiracy case was instituted in 1915.

3. MADRAS.

Revolutionary activities, though not of a very organized character, were also noticeable in Madras. According to official version, the people were excited by a series of lectures delivered by Bipin Chandra Pal of Calcutta in May, 1907. He preached the ideal of complete freedom from British control. According to a report in the *Bande Mataram* of May 27, 1907, a Madrasi lecturer, who spoke in a meeting after B. C. Pal, openly advocated the manufacture of bombs. He urged that Indians should visit foreign countries and return to their country to sacrifice on every new moon night 108 whites (not white lambs but those who were their enemies). Early in 1908 copies of a pamphlet describing the secret organization of the Russians were found in possession of students. On the 9th of March Chidambaram Pillai delivered a speech in Tinnevelly asking the people to boycott everything foreign and assuring them that in three months they would obtain *Swaraj*. He and Subramania Shiva, who also delivered a seditious speech advocating absolute *Swaraj*, were arrested on the 12th of March, and on the 13th a serious riot broke out in Tinnevelly. Many public buildings were attacked and partially burnt, while furniture and records were set on fire. Revolutionary ideas were preached in public meetings and in newspapers in the most violent language. Some sort of secret association was organized by Nilakanta Brahmachari. He was soon joined by Vanchi Aiyar, a clerk in the Travancore Forest Department. In December, 1910, V. V. S. Aiyar, a follower of V. D. Savarkar at the India House, London, arrived in Pondi-

cherry. He started revolver practice for young Indians and preacheed the necessity of violence and assassination to free the country. He was joined by Vanchi Aiyar. Vanchi Aiyar then made a plot to kill Europeans and suggested that Mr. Ashe should be first killed as he had taken a leading part in the events of 1908. Mr. Ashe, the District Magistrate of Tinnevelly, was shot on the 17th of June, 1911, by Vanchi Aiyar, (a member of the Bharat-mata Association at Tuticorin) in a railway carriage. On the body of the latter was found a letter in Tamil, which "stated that every Indian was trying to drive out the English and that 3000 Madrasis had taken a vow to kill Goerge V as soon as he landed in the country. To make known their nitentions to others, he, Vanchi, the least in the company, had done that deed."

This led to the Tinnevelly Conspiracy case in which nine persons were found guilty of conspiracy against the State. After this trial the revoluionary acivity was not manifested in Madras.

III. EARLY REVOLUTIONARY ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE INDIA

As has been noted above, the leaders of Indian National Congress pinned their faith on the honesty and sense of justice of the people of Great Britain, and took various steps to carry on propaganda work among the English. Towards the close of the nineteenth century the Nationalists felt similar need of propaganda work in other countries of Europe and America, in order to establish usefufl international contacts, interpret India's aspirations and gain help and sympathy for India's cause. For this purpose they visited different countries and tried through ectures and newspaper articles to convey accurate information about the nature of British rule in India in order to counteract British propaganda and explain the political objects of her people.

Even the veteran Congress leader Dadabhai Naoroji joined this activity and placed the case of India before the Congress of Socialists held in 1904 at Amsterdam.[14] Some prominent Nationalist leaders like Lajpat Rai visited America and delivered lectures. That all these had produced some effect will be clear from the following Press cuttings :

The *Freeman's Journal* of Sydney, New South Wales, wrote: "Indeed the people of India are now beginning to learn the principles of liberty, which are so popular in this country but which were never meant for exportation to the Asiatic territories controlled by Great Britain. Naturally, we wish the people of India every success in their endeavour to emancipate themselves and to work out their own salvation according to their own national characteristics. It is . useless to argue that the yellow man cannot govern himself. Japan is a convincing illustration of the contrary, and Japan has worked out her salvation under her own rules".[15]

American President Roosevelt's fuflsome and unmerited praise of British rule in India did not pass unchal!enged in the country of his brith. An open letter of protest was sent to Mr. Roosevelt, signed by eighteen prominent American citizens, in which it was shown how India had no real liberty, how there was despotic censorship of telegraphic and other news whieh prevented true information from reaching foreign countries, how there was in India taxation without representation, how so far as the people's having any voice in the government of their country is concerned the administration was more despotic than in Russia, how in the language of Burke the British were "birds of passage" and exploiters, how there was imprisonment without trial, how India possessed historic greatness, how India was unjust!y denied self-government, how British rule in India was irresponsible, how Indians were cruelly slandered, how theii country was exploited by the British and drained of her wealth, how it was the money taken from Bengal that was the foundation of great industrial prosperity of Britain, how India was "bled", how India was taxed more heavily than any other civilized land if measured by ability to pay, how salt was taxed 2,000 per cent., how exorbitant taxation led to famines, how education was neglected, how Indians were hewers of wood and drawers of water in their own country, and how Indian money was misused, etc., etc. The signatories to the letter quoted authorities for their statements.[16]

The Indian Revolutionaries also, from the very beginning, realised the importance of setting up centres in foreign countries. In addition to securing fofrfeign help it gave them the additional

advantage of carrying on their activities without any fear from the Indian police. One of the earliest Indians to organize such activities was Shyamji Krishna Varma. He was born in 1857 in Western India. After graduating at Cambridge and being called to the Bar he returned to India, and served three Indian States with distinction. He was greatly influenced by Dayananda and Tilak and settled in London shortly after the murder of Rand in 1897. Early in 1905, he organized there "Indian Home Rule Society" and issued as its organ a journal called the *Indian Sociologist.* He established six lectureships of Rs. 1000 each for qualified Indians who visited foreign countries, and another Indian in Paris, Sri Sardar Singh Rana, also offered three travelling scholarships of Rs. 2,000 each. By these means a group of revolutionaries was collected round Shyamji, among whom the most prominent were Vinayak Savarkar, Hardayal and Madan Lal Dhingra. The centre of their activities was the "India House" founded by Shyamji in London.

The Indian Home Rule Society was founded on the 18th of February, 1905, with the object of securing Home Rule for India by carrying on propaganda in the United Kingdom by all practical means. Regarding the general object, both of the Society as well as of its organ, the *Indian Sociologist,* Shyamji stated as follows :

"No systematic attempt has ever been made by Indians to enlighten the British public with regard to the grievances, demands and aspirations of the people of India. It will be our duty and privilege to plead the cause of India and its unrepresented millions before the bar of public opinion in Great Britain and Ireland."

The views presented in the paper more or less faithfully reflected the Nationalist creed in India. It laid down absolute freedom from British control as the political goal of India. As regards the method, it laid the greatest stress on passive resistance in an extreme form, which meant a complete dissociation from Englishmen as the chief means of forcing the British to quit India.[17] It quoted passages from Meredith Townshend's work, *Asia and Europe,* and the writings of J. R. Seeley to show that these English writers themselves held the view that by completely withholding so-operation with the Englishmen the

British empire could be brought down in a night, and that it was not, therefore, necessary to resort to arms for compelling England to leave India. He also quoted an extract from Tolstoy's work on the Russian revolution, which may be summed up as follows :

"If the 200 million Hindus did not submit to the British, if they did not enlist, paid no taxes, were not temped by rewards offered by the conquerors, and did not submit to the English laws introduced among them, then all the Englishmen in the world could not enslave India."

But though Shyamji was in favour of peaceful methods of passive resistance, he did not rule out violence or under-estimate its value as a method for securing the freedom of India. He contended that Indians were perfectly justified in waging war against any representatives of the British ruling class who constituted the most organized gang of robbers and murderers of the Indian people. Later, he even proceeded further and said that so long as free agitation was allowed, the resort to violent practices was not necessary in the case of India, but every fresh measure of British repression and aggression, restricting, for instance, the liberty of the press, freedom of speech and right of public meeings, imposes on Indian patriots a corresponding duty to make futile the eflorts of the alien despotism by employing all such means as may advance the cause of Indian independence....."

But he never gave up the idea of passive resistance. Even while commending violence as a legitimate method for securing independence, he thought that there was no need to resort to it. "Our chief mode of action is nothing bloody ; but it is boycott ; not the simple and childish commercial boycott, but that of all classes of the English nation. The day on which the English official does not find Indian servant, the Government no more police, the army no more recruits, the British rule will be a thing of the past."

The *Indian Sociologist* made a great scoop by publishing a daring placard issued in April, 1859, by late Dr. Richard Congreve, founder of the Positivist Community in England. The placard was a protest against the thanksgiving ceremony arranged by the British Government on the 1st of May, 1859, on the

victorious conclusion of the war against the mutinous sepoys. It ran thus :

"Believing the cause of the British in India to be unjust and that of the Hindus just, as the legitimate effort of a nation to shake off an oppressive foreign yoke, and believing consequently the English success to be the triumph of force over right.....in the name of humanity I publicly protest against the thanksgiving as an act at variance with the national professions of a free people, repugnant to the spirit of Christianity which the nation yet recognizes, and an outrage of all the higher feelings of mankind."

This placard was republished in the *Indian Sociologist* shortly before the anniversary of the Indian rebellion which was celebrated in the India House. Alongside the revolutionary activities the Indians in London were carrying on constitutional agitation also. On December 20, 1908, a National Conference characterised the Minto-Morley reforms, then in the offing, as "deceptive, disappointing and insulting, inasmuch as they will promote communal tension in India." The main resolution demanded *Swaraj* for India which was defined as absolute political independence.

The British newspapers and politicians were getting alarmed at the activities of the Indians in England. The *Standard* summed up their feelings thus : "It is beyond question that not a few of the highly intelligent Indians in our Universities and reading for the Bar, are striving their utmost by such means, particularly to accustom the minds of young rising generation to the idea of an armed revolt." So perturbed were the British politicians that a meeting was organized under the presidency of an ex-Governor of Bombay, Lord Lamington, to adopt means to 'socialise' the revolutionary Indian element. One of the speakers at the meeting was Sir William Lee-Warner, who called an Indian revolutionary, Kunjabihari Bhattacharyya, "a dirty nigger". The remark so much exacerbated the Indian audience that one of them, Vasudeo Bhattacharyya, struck a blow on the face of Sir William. Vasudeo was prosecuted and fined Rs. 20.

One of the associates of Shyamji Krishna Varma's political activities was Madam Bhikhaji Rustam Cama,[18] who has earned undying reputation as the Mother of the Indian Revolution. Madam Cama left India for Europe in 1902 and dedicated her life to the service of her motherland by means of revolutionary propaganda in Europe and America. She issued a stirring appeal to her countrymen in India and abroad as a protest against the deportation of Lala Lajpat Rai and Ajit Singh. This was published in the *Indian Sociologist,* and read out at the public meeting of Indians which was held at India House on 7 June to express sympathy with the deported Indian leaders.

Another associate of Shyamji Krishna Varma was Sardar Singh Rana of Lambdi in Saurashtra. He left India in 1898 and helped the Indian revolutionaries, as noted above. He organized the first meeting of Indian patriots in Paris on May 5, 1905, to protest against the British rule in India and to condemn the action of the police in arresting Surendra Nath Banerji and beating the members of a political procession at Barisal in 1906. During the world war I he was deported to the island of Martinique by the French Government on the ground of pro-German tendency.

Both Madam Cama and Sardar Singh Rana lived in Paris. They were elected to represent India at the International Socialist Congress which met at Stuttagart on the 18th of August, 1907. She moved there the following Resolution :

"That the continuance of British rule in India is positively disastrous and extremely injurious to the best interests of India, and lovers of freedom all over the world ought to co-operate in freeing from slavery the fifth of the human race inhabiting that oppressed country, since the perfect social state demands that no people should be subject to any despotic or tyrannical form of Government".

She made a fiery speech, enumerating the evils of British rule in India, and concluded her address by unfolding the National Flag—a banner of three horizontal bands, the uppermost green, the central of golden hue and the lower, red.[18a]

Excepting Mr. Hyndman, the rest of the British delegation including Ramsay Macdonald opposed it and left the meeting in protest. They prevented its being adopted at the Conference.

For, though eventually Madam Cama was allowed to make a fiery speech and even to unfurl and wave the Indian National Flag before the vast assembly, the resolution was not allowed by the President to be put to vote on the technical ground that "it was not submitted to the International Bureau." "President Singer, however, consoled the Conference with the reflection that the spirit of the resolution is approved by the Bureau and the Conference."

The publication of Madan Cama's appeal and the growing revolutionary attitude of Shyamji gradually drew the attention of the British Government, and the attack against them was begun by the *Times* and other newspapers. In reply to the charge of the British newspapers Shyamji stated as follows :

"We are not aware of having advocated 'armed rebellion', in any number of this journal.....But at the same time we may say that we are not opposed on principle to an armed rebellion like some who denounce all revolutions wrought out by force of arms, holding, as we do, that 'resistance to aggression is not simply justifiable but imperative.' (Herbert Spencer)..... Each case must be judged on its own merits, and we think that Indians need not resort to arms in order to throw off the alien yoke".

But, nevertheless, Shyamji thought it prudent to leave London and settle in Paris. One of his last acts was to translate in Hindi and English the French National song "La Marsellaise". In 1907 he shifted his centre to Paris but kept in touch with the "India House" in London, which formed the home of his revolutionary disciples. After the outbreak of the World War in 1914 he left Paris for Switzerland which was neutral in the War. There he stayed till his death in 1930.

In the absence of Shyamji, the proprietor, and Mr. Rana, the Manager, Savarkar assumed the political leadership of the India House. In 1907 he held a private celebration of the 50th anniversary of Sepoy Mutiny, which he called the first National War of Independence. In 1908 he celebrated the 51st anniversary. The celebration attracted particular attention on account of a patriotic leaflet (*O ! Martyrs*) which was freely distributed at the meeting and also sent to India in large number. It was a long document full of patriotic fervour and breathing fiery

determination to free India from the control of the British. One passage may be quoted as a specimen:

"We take up your cry, we revere your flag, we are determined to continue that fiery mission of away with the foreigners'.....for the war of 1857 shall not cease till the rebellion arrives striking the enemy into dust, elevating liberty to the throne.....revolutionary war knows no truce save liberty or death." The most important overt act of this group was the murder of Curzon Wyllie by Madan Lal Dhingra at a gathering at the Inperial Institute in London on July 1, 1909. Madan Lal himself stated; "I attempted to shed English blood intentionally and of purpose as an humble protest against the inhuman transportation and hangings of Indian youths." He was hanged and Savarkar was also arrested; and thus the activities of the India House and of the group of Shyamji Krishna Varma practically came to an end.

Soon after the murder of Curzon Wyllie Savarkar was arrested and sent to India to take his trial in the Nasik Conspiracy case and on other charges. He was sentenced to two terms of transporation for life on two counts.

On his way to India Savarkar made an attempt to escape to French territory. This historic, almost romantic, episode is thus described in offical record :

The morning after the arrival of S. S. *Morea* at Marseilles (8th July) at about six o'clock, Savarkar got out of his berth. Parker, the Police (C. I. D.) Officer sent from London to watch him, sat up in his berth and asked him to see what time it was by his watch which was lying on a cabinet in the cabin. Savarkar said it was 6.15 and returned to his bed. Parker remained half awake. About a quarter of an hour later Savarkar said he wanted to go to the water closet. Parker unlocked the cabin door and took him in the direction of the lavatory. The two Head Constables, Siddick and Sing, were standing near the kit boxes which were kept in the passage about 12 feet beyond the entrance to the lavatory. Parker beckoned to them. They both approached him at a quick pace buttoning their coats as they came along. Savarkar and Parker entered the lavatory and were followed immediately by the two Head Constables. Parker allowed Savarkar to enter one of the water closets the door of

which was open. It was the second one from the end, opposite the urinals. Savarkar closed the door. Parker stepped on the platform of the urinal and could see Savarkar on the seat through the opening over the door which was about 18 inches wide. Parker noticed that the port-hole in the W. C. in which Savarkar was seated, was shut. All the port-holes were closed owing to the steamer having coaled during the night. Parker then directed Sing to stand up on the platform and keep an eye on Savarkar from there. Siddick was standing at the door of the W. C. between Sing and Savarkar. Parker returned to the cabin to dress himself.

There was an opening of about three inches at the top and bottom of all the closet doors. Sing peeped under the door and saw two slippers as if the person who wore them was seated. Sing concluded it was Savarkar, but to make sure he stood on a urinal and peeped through the opening over the door. He saw Savarkar's body half through the port-hole. He shouted at him and tried to force the door open but it would not yield. Two panes of glass broke in the door. Simultaneous with Sing's attempt to force the door, Savarkar disappeared through the port-hole. Sing immediately raised an alarm and ran on deck to secure Savarkar. Head Constable Siddick also went with him. They ran on the quay. Savarkar had landed on the quay as these two appeared on the deck. The side of the ship was about 10 to 12 feet from the quay. Savarkar had to swim that distance to reach land. As soon as he landed on the quay he commenced to run. Mahomed Siddick and Sing ran after him, shouting "catch him" "catch him". Some of the ship's crew joined in the chase. Savarkar ran for about 200 yards and then stopped, partly from exhaustion and partly owing to his progress being blocked by a number of Frenchmen who were employees of the dock. A gendarme on the quay also joined in the pursuit. They all came up together. Sing seized Savarkar by the back of the neck, the second Saloon Head Steward of the *Morea* seized his right wrist and the gendarme his left wrist. Savarkar said to the gendarme : "Take me into your custody. Assist me. Take me before a Magistrate." The gendarme did not understand English and none of the others could speak French. They took him back on board the

Morea and went straight to the cabin of Mr. Power, Asst. Superintendent of Police from Bombay, who was sent to bring Savarkar to India. The door of the cabin was closed. Some knocked at the door. Parker opened it and found Savarkar standing outside the cabin door guarded by a gendarme, the two Head Constables, and some of the ship's Stewards. Savarkar's clothes were quite wet : Head Constable Sing reported what had happened to Power in Hindustani. Mr. Power informed Parker that Savarkar had escaped through the port-hole of the W. C. and had been captured on the quay. Parker afterwards was informed by the French police officer who accompanied Savarkar on board, that he had seen Savarkar running along the quay and had stopped him and brought him back to the ship. Later in the day Commissaire M. Le. Blais came and saw both Mr. Power and Parker, inspected the W. C. from which Savarkar had escaped, and said he would have to report the matter to the French authorities. The ship remained at Marseilles until 11 a.m. the next day when she sailed for Port Said. Between the second visit of M. Le. Blais and the departure of the ship nothing transpired. No other French official came to make any enquiries about the matter. After Savarkar was brought on board, Parker telegraphed to Superintendent Quinn, New Scotland Yard, as follows : "Prisoner attempted escape. Recaptured. Report follows."

BOOK III, CHAPTER VI.

1. Vol. I, pp. 404, 406.
2. See Vol. I, p. 405.

2a. It has been stated in many books that the Yugantar had its own press from the very beginning. But the author of this book, then a student of the I.A. (then called F.A.) class, lived in the upper storey of the building, in the groundfloor of which was situated the Kamala Press of his elder brother P. C. Majumdar and still remembers that the Yugantar was printed there at the very beginning.

3. So says Bhupendra Nath Datta in his Bengali book *Bharater Dvitiya Svadhinata Sangrama*, Vol. I, p. 40, but there is no corroborative evidence, and Surendra Nath's own version has been given later, in Chapter VIII, Section V.

4. For a detailed account of the preparation of the bomb, cf. B. N. Datta, op. cit., pp. 151-3.

4a. There are, however, some grounds to believe that the Police had some information about the revolutionary activities at the Muraripukur garden even before the throwing of bombs at Muzaffarpur. Further mystery is caused by the following secret code telegram to the Calcutta Police from Muzaffarpur: "Please take immediate steps to verify Khuidram's confession under strong guard so as to connect him with Calcutta criminals and to trace explosives to that source".

This is likely to rouse the suspicion that Khudiram made a confession about the activities in Muraripukur garden. But it is not reasonable to entertain such a view of the great martyr without more positive, direct and clear evidence about the nature of the confession, which is, however, not yet available.

I am indebted to Sri Kalicharan Ghosh for supplying me a copy of the telegram included in the official records.

4b. Many stories are current about the means by which the revolvers were smuggled into the jail. The most reliable view seems to be that Srish Chandra Ghosh and Basanta Kumar Banerjee, two revolutionaries of the Chandernagar group, concealed the revolvers under their *chadar* and, while visiting the prisoners, passed them through the gratings of the window which had no wire-netting. They were kept hidden in a hole dug up beneath the pillow of a prisoner. For full details Cf. Ghosh K. C. *Jagaran O Bishphoran*, II. 304.

4c. *Biplabi Jibaner Smriti*-Autobiography (in Bengali), pp. 277-8.

On the other hand the efficacy of bombs in the struggle for freedom was expounded at length by Tilak immediately after the Bomb outrage at Muzaffarpur though, at least outwardly, he "deplored the bomb outrage." His views have been quoted in Chapter VII.

5. This account is based on the documents of the *Anusilan Samiti* seized by the Police. cf. *Sedition Committee's Report*, 93 ff.

6. N. K. Guha, *Banglay Biplabvad*, p. 81.

6a. For a discussion of the Muslim participation in the revolutionary movement, cf. A. C. Guha, *First Spark of Revolution*, p. 147.

6b. Cf. Uma Mukherjee, *Two Great Indian Revolutionaries*, p. 24; I. B. Records of the Government of West Bengal: F. N. 1270/1913. A. C. Guha, op. cit., p. 181.

6c. For a detailed account of this, one of the most successful adventures of the revolutionaries, cf. Uma Mukherjee, op. cit., pp. 48-54; Bhupendra Kishor Rakshit Ray, *Bharate Sasastra Biplab* (in Bengali), pp. 131-47.

7. This account is based on the statement, both oral and written, of one who had himself taken part in the dacoity. A somewhat

different and more detailed account is given by N. K. Guha op. cit., pp. 102-7.

8. A report with the title "Connections with the Revolutionary Organization in Bihar and Orissa, 1906-16", compiled by W. Sealy and marked "strictly secret", It was printed by the Bihar Government in 1917

9. See pp. 268, 270.

10. See pp. 289 ff.

11. O'Dwyer, 184.

12. Vol. I, pp. 396-99.

13. Cf. Vol. I, pp. 396 ff. For a fuller account cf. Savarkar, pp. 18-26.

13a. According to some Madam Cama confessed to the British Consul General that she herself sent pistols through Chaturbhuj Amin and neither Savarkar nor Rana knew anything about it. This may be a false statement deliberately made to save Savarkar who was then being tried at Nasik on the charge of murdering Jackson (see p. 292). Cf. Abinash Chandra Bhattacharya, *Europe Bharatiya Biplaber Sadhana* (in Bengali, p. 66. Reports about Mirza Abbas and Sikandar Hyat carrying the revolvers cannot be verified by any authentic evidence.

13b. See pp. 285 ff.

14. For the summary of his speech, cf. *MR*, III. 527.

15. *MR*, V. 475.

16. Ibid, 475-6.

17. For a detailed programme of his Passive Resistance, which closely resembled that of Gandhi, Cf. Harbilas Sarda, *Shyamji Krishna Varma* (Ajmer, 1954-59), pp. 85-7.

18. For an account of Madam Cama's activities in Europe, cf. *Essays Presented to Sir Jadhunath Sarkar*, p. 227;
Dictionary of National Biography, Edited by S. P. Sen, Vol. I, pp. 240-42.

18a. Different accounts are given of the exact nature of the flag. According to an official record (Foreign Department, External B, Confidential, 1911, No. 62), the flag had three horizontal bands. The topmost was coloured green and decorated with eight stars (representing the eight provinces of British India). The central band of golden colour was engraved with the words *Bande Mataram* in Nagri alphabet, while the lowest was plain, and red in colour. A photo of Madan Cama with the flag, unfurled, in hand, given on page 80 of the book, *Savarkar And His Times* by Dhananjay Keer, however, shows the representations of the Sun and Moon on the two ends of the lowest band. Of course, the photo does not give an idea of the colour of the different bands.

CHAPTER VII.

HOME RULE MOVEMENT

I. THE DIFFERENT POLITICAL PARTIES (1907—14)

While the militant nationalism convulsed the whole country, the Indian National Congress, now representing only the Moderates, pursued its old course. As mentioned above,[1] the Moderate Convention appointed a Committee after the break-up of the Congress session at Surat. It met in Allahabad in April, 1908, and drew up a constitution for the Indian National Congress and a set of rules for the conduct of meetings. This constitution was adopted in the Congress session which had been adjourned at Surat in December, 1907, and met again at Madras in December, 1908. The Articles I and II of the constitution, which were the vital ones, read as follows :

Article I : The objects of the Indian National Congress are the attainment by the people of India of a system of Government similar to that enjoyed by the Self-Governing Members of the British Empire, and a participation by them in the rights and responsibilities of the Empire on equal terms with those members. These objects are to be achieved by constitutional means, by bringing about a steady reform of the existing system of administration, and by promoting national unity, fostering public spirit, and developing and organising the intellectual, moral, economic and industrial resources of the country. (This is the famous "Creed").

Article II : Every delegate to the Indian National Congress shall express in writing his acceptance of the objects of the Congress as laid down in Article I of this Constitution, and his willingness to abide by this Constitution and by the Rules of the Congress hereto appended.

These and some other provisions barred the door of the Congress against the Extremist Party and, for all practical purposes, the Congress became a party organization instead of national institution. It is interesting to note that the resolu-

tions on Boycott and National Education, passed by the Congress in the Calcutta session of 1906, were not adopted by the Congress in Madras or any subsequent session. This lends great weight to the suspicion of the Extremists that the Moderates would not have adopted them at Surat.

The Conrgress lost popularity, the average number of delegates, during the five years after Surat, being about 400, and on two occasions it was as low as 243 and 207, as against more than 1600 in the two preceding sessions at Surat and Calcutta. Neither the public nor the Government attached any importance to its deliberations.

The Nationalist or Extremist Party, which was debarred from the Congress, had no organized political activity after the split of 1907. Left to itself it might have developed a separate rival organization to the Congress. But that was not to be. The Government were resolved to stamp out the nationalist movement by the coercive measures, mentioned above, against Press and public meeting, and the removal of its prominent leaders out of harm's way. Lala Lajpat Rai was deported to 1907, and Arabinda Ghose was locked up as an undertrial prisoner in 1908. Though both of them were released soon, the latter chose to retire from politics and lead the life of a recluse at Pondicherry.[1a] But the most serious blow to the party was the imprisonment of Tilak in 1908, for a period of six years. The nationalist movement, without any leader and organization, and crushed by repressive measures, went underground and terrorist outrages increased by leaps and bounds as described in the last chapter.

The Muslim League was the only political party that showed new life and strength after the split of the Congress at Surat. It demanded of the Hindus a frank recognition of the fact that communal and religious differences must be the basis of all political reforms in India.

The first annual session of the Muslim League was held at Karachi on 29 December, 1907. The choice of the site was an indication of the new nationalism which was growing among the Muslims, and, as in the case of the Hindus, it was based on religion and historical traditions of past glory and greatness. Karachi, the chief town of Sindh, was chosen because, as a Lea-

gue publication put it, "Sindh is that pious place in India, where Muhammad Bin Qasim came first, with the torch of religion and the gift of *Hadis*. No other place could appeal to our elders." More significant still was the remark of the President : "If a handful of men under a boy could teach *kalima* to the territory of Sindh and promulgate the law of true *shariat* of God and His Rasul, can seven crores of Mussalmans not make their social and political life pleasant ?"[2] Like the Congress the Muslim League appointed its British Committee in England under the Presidentship of Syed Ameer Ali. Durng the discussion of the Morley-Minto reform proposals, the League put its whole weight in favour of a communal electorate for the Muslims, and rejected all proposals of Joint Electorate,—even the compromise formula of Morley. By holding up the bogey of Muslim League Minto succeeded in stifling the voice of Morley. A very small section of Muslims raised their voice in favour of Joint Electorate, but it was drowned amidst the vociferous cry of the overwhelming majority.

After the reforms of 1909, the Hindu leaders believed that as the Muslims had now secured all that they wanted, they would be in a mood to come to an amicable settlement with the Hindus. Accordingly a Hindu-Muslim Conference met at Allahabad on 1 January, 1911, attended by about 60 Hindus and 40 Muslims. It achieved nothing of importance.

The oft-repeated public declaration of the Hindu leaders that no political progress was possible in India without an understanding between the Hindus and Muslims, had an inevitable tendency to raise the Muslim demands higher and higher. When Gokhale asked the Allahabad Conference to remember that the Muslim fears of being dominated by the Hindu majority should not be lightly treated, he put his seal of approval on all that the Aligarh Movement stood for in politics. But the most significant was an utterance of Gandhi., reported in the *Indian Review* of October, 1909. He said : "As a man of truth I honestly believe that Hindus should yield up to the Mahommedans what the latter desire, and that they should rejoice in so doing. We can expect unity only if such mutual large-heartedness is displayed."[3] The first sentence is one of those pro-Muslim sayings which bore the special trademark of Gandhi and did incal-

culable harm to the Hindu-Muslim unity by putting a premium on Muslim intransigence. It was repeated in 1947 when Gandhi made the proposal, which astounded even his devoted followers, that Jinnah should be the supreme ruler in India with a cabinet of his own choice, which might consist of only Muslim ministers. The word 'mutual' in the second sentence is meaningless, as Gandhi never dared make similar request to the Muslims and they never showed the slightest intention of doing any such foolish thing. Gandhi's attitude did not change even after the creation of Pakistan.

What pious wishes and noble sentiments failed to achieve, seemed to have been accomplished by stress of political events in and outside India, which alienated the Muslims from the British and drew them closer to the Hindus. . The annulment of the Partition of Bengal' in 1911 gave a rude shock to the Muslim faith in the British Government. The Muslims were further alienated from the British on account of the latters's hostility to Islam as evidenced by British occupation of Egypt, Anglo-French agreement with regard to Morocco, Anglo-Russian agreement with regard to Persia, and the invasion of Tripoli by Italy. The active part taken by the British in all these incidents as well as their connivance at, if not actual support and sympathy to, the seizure of the Turkish province of Tripoli by Italy in 1911 and the loss of European provinces of Turkey in 1912, was interpreted as a definite move for. the extinction of the power of Islam, both temporal, and indirectly, also spiritual. The consequent change in the outlook of the Muslims was expressed by Muhammad Ali in the following words:

"Nothing could have more clearly convinced them that their dependence upon a foreign Government for support against sister communities laid them perpetually open to such betrayals. They now realised that they could place no reliance on such support, whether at home or abroad, and it set them thinking that perhaps at much smaller sacificed of their interests they could purchase lasting peace and even secure the friendship of their neighbours and fellow-countrymen."[4] It is interesting to note that this very policy was denounced by Muhammad Ali himself in an article entitled 'Communal Patriot' published in 1912 in his paper, the *Comrade*.[5] The Muslim League, in its annual ses-

sion of 1913, adopted a new constitution which accepted the Congress ideal of self-government under the British crown, and sought to achieve it by promoting national unity and co-operat-rating with the other communities. The Congress welcomed the change and showed its jubilation in various ways. But it was an ill-conceived and premature delight. It should have been understood by the Congress that the new policy of the Muslim League did not indicate a national, as opposed to a communal, outlook in its basic approach to the political problems of India.

It is quite clear from the address of Muhammad Ali, referred to above, and the speeches and writings of other Muslim leaders, that there was no whittling down, not to speak of abandonment, of the communal spirit based on the fundamental conception that the Muslims formed a separate political entity. The reference in the Muslim League's resolution to 'co-operating with the other communities' set the seal of approval upon two assumption whose ominous significance was missed even by the advanced Hindu politicians of the time. In the first place, it recognized the Muslims as forming a separate political community in India which might extend its hand of co-operation, if it so chose, to the other communities, and, therefore, also might not do the same if its own interest dictated otherwise. In other words, the resolution reiterated the statement of Muhammad Ali that there were three parties in India, the Hindus, the Muslims and the Government, and the Muslims were free to co-operate with the one or the other according as it suited their own interests. This was clearly emphasized by laying down that one of the objects of the Muslim League was "to protect and advance the political and other rights and interests of the Indian Musalmans." This clearly foreshadowed what came to be known later as the two-nation theory of Jinnah.

Secondly, as the co-operation with the other communities was primarily intended to cover co-operation with the Indian National Congress, the new policy of the Muslim League was a definite repudiation of the Congress claim to represent the whole of India, including the Musalmans. Thus the new constitution of the Muslim League, which was hailed with delight by the Hindu political leaders as well as the Indian National Congress, was tantamount to a declaration by the League, and the

tacit acceptance by the Congress, that the Indian population consisted of at least two, if not more, independent political entities, and by no means formed a homogeneous nation. The foundations of Pakistan were thus well and truly laid with the full concurrence of the Indian National Congress.

Finally, there cannot be any reasonable doubt that the Muslim policy of alliance with the Hindus was largely influenced by the pan-Islamic sentiments. For, the political interests of the Muslim world counted far more with the Indian Muslims than the political progress of India. They did not hesitate to help the British in keeping India under subjection, but turned against them merely at the apprehension of similar danger to foreign Muslim States. In other words, the Muslims of India were less concerned with the British treatment of India than with the attitude of the British towards the Muslim States outside India. They refused to join the Hindus in a common political campaign against the British because they believed that their interests could be better served by following a pro-British policy. But they were prepared to sacrifice them at the mere threat of danger to Islam. They were quite ready, for the sake of Islam, to make sacrifices which they were not prepared to make for India or their fellow-subjects, the Hindus. The attitude of the Muslims may do credit to their religious sentiment, but it cut at the very root of Indian nationalism.

II. THE FIRST WORLD WAR (1914—18)

1. The Events Leading to the War.

Reference has been made above to the reaction of European events on Muslim politics in India. But far more profound was the effect produced on all the political parties in India by the Great War of 1914-18. Although it proved to be a turning point in the history of the world, it is unnecessary for our present purpose to discuss its causes and incidents in detail, and a brief general account must suffice.

The most outstanding event in the history of Europe during the last quarter of the nineteenth century was the emergence of Germany as the greatest military power in the World, as a result

of her brilliant victory over France in 1870. The foundation of the German Empire, which followed, was the greatest achievement of Bismark, and in ordder to secure it against the intrigues of France he formed an alliance with Austria in 1879. This Dual Alliance was joined by Italy in 1882, and the three great Powers of the Triple Alliance formed a solid bloc across the centre of Europe. This formidable combination of the Central Powers in Europe alarmed France and she concluded an alliance with Russia. With the creation of these two power blocs, the attitude of Britain became an important factor in European politics. Britain felt no sympathy towards the French who had opposed her in Egypt, and she herself had opposed Russia in the Balkans, Persia, and Afghanistan, almost throughout the nineteenth century. So the natural inclination of Britain was to join Germany, rather than France. But the British negotiations for an alliance with Germany, first in 1898 and again in 1902, broke down, as the Kaiser did not show any eagerness or inclination to it. This, as well as the big programme of naval building launched by Germany, forced Britain to turn towards France, and the result was the Anglo-French *entente* of 1904. The *Entente Cordiale*, as it was called, was a friendly understanding with promise of diplomatic support to each other's imperial designs; but it was not a definite military alliance, offensive or defensive. In 1907 Britain concluded a similar *entente* with Russia, as a result of which Persia was divided into two spheres of influence, respectively of Russia and Britain. Towards the end of 1912 Germany increased her huge army, and a common fear drew the British and the French closer together. A naval agreement was concluded between the two to the effect that the French fleet would be concentrated in the Mediterranean while the British fleet would guard the North Sea. But no definite military alliance was concluded.

While Europe was thus divided into two hostile armed camps, as it were, there occurred tensions between the two, threatening war on more than one occasion. The aggressive attitude of Germany, which led to these tensions, was caused by two factors. In the first place, she complained of being 'encircled' by the Franco-Russian alliance backed by British support. Secondly, while Britain and France had established big colonial

empires, comprising the fairest portions of the earth, nothing, or very little, was left for the growing German empire. Germany indignantly felt that she has been denied her rightful 'place in the sun', and was in need of *lebensraum* or more living space. These two were the main causes of the strained relations between Germany and the *entente Powers*, specially Britain and France, which caused frequent tensions and ultimately led to war.

In 1905 the French attempted to establish a Protectorate in Northern Morocco, but in spite of British support, the project was foiled by the bellicose attitude of Germany. A far greater crisis arose in 1908 when Austria-Hungary annexed the Jugo-Slav countries of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Russia, the self-constituted guardian and protector of the Slavs, wanted to intervene, but had to climb down in the face of German support to Austria. In 1911 Germany protested against the renewed French activity in Morocco, and emphasized it by sending the gunboat *Panther* to Agadir, a lonely seaport on the Moroccan coast. The German Government took no notice of British protest, and France was forced to make concessions to Germany.

Racial questions made the political situation very tense in the Balkans. The Muslim Turks who ruled over the territory were hated by the Christian population. Backed by the sympathy of Russia, the Balkan allies—Greece, Serbia and Bulgaria—declared war against Turkey in 1912, and practically drove the Turks out of their European territories save Constantinople. But next year, the victors quarrelled among themselves. The Bulgarians, who attacked their allies, were defeated. As a result they had to surrender to Serbia some of the territories they had gained in 1912. This caused deep-seated hostility between Serbia and Bulgaria, and animated the Slavs in Bosnia and other regions with a desire to be united to their victorious brethren in Serbia.

In a fateful moment the Archduke Franz Ferdinand, the heir to the Australian throne, paid a visit to Serajevo, the capital of Bosnia (annexed by Austria in 1908), and was murdered there by a Serbian subject of Austria (28 June, 1914). Austria held Serbian Government responsible for the foul plot and sent an ultimatum, demanding what practically amounted to an abject surrender on the part of Serbia. Germany promised support to Austria, and Russia took up the cause of weak Serbia against

her powerful neighbour. This stiffened the attitude of both Austria and Serbia, and all attempts to prevent the conflict, or even to localise it, failed. On 28 July, 1914, Austria declared war on Serbia. Russia began to mobilize and Germany sent an ultimatum demanding instant demobilization of Russian army. This being refused, Germany declared war on Russia and her ally, France.

Britain was now faced with a grave problem—whether to join France and Russia, or remain neutral. She was not bound by any treaty to come to the aid of France, and a majority of the British cabinet was against intervention. The situation was changed by a German ultimatum to Belgium demanding free passage of German armies through Belgium territory on their way to France. Belgium refused, and on 3 August, 1914, made an appeal to Britain for help. Britain's traditional policy was not to allow Belgian coast to be occupied by any great power which might use it as a basis for invading her. Besides, she was bound to help Belgium by an old treaty, concluded in 1839. As soon, therefore, as Germany invaded Belgium, Britain sent an ultimatum to Germany on 3 August to withdraw her forces from Belgian soil. Germany was given 24 hours' time, and as no reply was received within that period, Britain declared war against Germany on 4 August, 1914.

2. The Main Incidents of the War

i The Year 1914

The war that thus broke out at the beginning of August, 1914, was unprecendented in character. It was fought in land, sea and air, and, judged by the number of fighting men, the area of actual hostilities, and the weapons of war, nothing like this was hitherto known or even contemplated in the history of mankind.

The war began with an effort of Germany to overwhelm France. The German army passed through Belgium, overran Flanders, a part of North-Eastern France, and crossed the Marne, reaching within twenty miles of Paris. The battle of the Marne (6-13 September, 1914) stopped the advance of the

German army which fell back and entrenched itself along the line of the Aisne. In Belgium the British expeditionary force fought a fierce battle from 21 October to 11 November. Its casualties were 50,000, and the old British army practically ceased to exist. But the British line was not broken, and when winter came, the troops dug themselves in trenches, as in France. There was thus a permanent line of trenches extending from the western coast of Belgium to the borders of Switzerland. For four years the fighting in this zone was mostly reduced to a trench warfare.

In the east, the Russians penetrated into East Prussia. But the able leadership of the two great generals, Hindenburg and Ludendorff, the German army not only drove out the Russian, but also invaded Russian Poland. Austria, however, fared badly. She invaded Serbia twice but was driven back, while the Russian army advanced into Galicia.

Japan joined England and her allies under the terms of the Anglo-Japanese treaty of 1902. At the end of October, 1914, Turkey declared war on Britain and her allies. This was a threat to both Egypt and India. Egypt was forthwith annexed to the British empire and expeditions were sent to Mesopotamia and Palestine, in which the Indian army took the leading part

At sea the British reigned supreme. The German navy fought a single battle in the Falkland Islands and was defeated. Only a single German Cruiser, the *Emden,* roamed in the Pacific, causing much damage to British shipping and shelling the city of Madras on one occasion; but she was eventually sunk. Germany's fleet being shut up behind the defences, she could not send any help to her Colonies which fell into the hands of her enemies.

ii. Year 1915.

While the stalemate continued in the western front, Germany scored notable success in the east in 1915, and overran the whole of Russian Poland and Serbia. In order to counter this German offensive against Russia, an attempt was made to overthrow Turkey and get into touch with Russia through the Black Sea. But the British attempt to force the Straits of Dardanelles from the sea and to occupy Gallipoli Peninsula

ended in miserable failure with heavy loss. On the other hand, Italy joined the western allies in spite of the Triple Alliance referred to above, in the hope of getting rich compensations at the expense of Austria, which were guaranteed by France and Britain in the Treaty of London (April, 1915). This was however, more than offset by the alliance of Bulgaria with Germany and their joint invasion of Serbia which was completely overrun.

iii. Year 1916.

The Germans made a determined effort to break the French line at Verdun, but although the battle raged fiercely from February to July, and there were terrible losses on both sides, the French held tenaciously to the great fort. The British launched a terrible attack on the Germans on the bank of the Somme, and though the battle raged till the middle of November and the British casualties were 400,000, they made hardly any appreciable gain. Austria suffered by the advance of the Russians and the Italians into her territory, respectively from the east and the west. But Russia was on the verge of collapse owing to internal troubles, and Rumania, which joined the western allies in August, was completely overrun. The British Indian army surrendered (April) to the Turks at Kut in Mesopotamia and made little advance in Palestine. But British diplomacy triumphed by organizing an Arab revolt against Turkey under Colonel Lawrence which ultimately led to the disruption of the Turkish empire. There was a naval engagement at Jutland (May) in which a British squadron suffered heavily, though the main German fleet evaded a trial of strength with the British fleet by escaping during the night.

iv. Year 1917.

The Germans delivered a terrible blow at Britain by launching an unrestricted submarine warfare on 1 February, 1917. Britain had already declared at the beginning of the war a complete blockade of Germany and was successful in enforcing it with the help of her powerful navy. But whereas British navy intercepted neutral vessels and examined their destination

and cargo, the German Government declared that any ship starting from, or destined for, the British Isles would be sunk at sight by their submarines. The consequent loss of British shipping was so heavy that Britain was almost forced to come to terms. In April, 875,000 tons of shipping were sunk and only six weeks' corn supply remained in the country. Britain was, however, saved by adopting the convoy system by which a large number of merchant ships was despatched together under escort of armed vessels.

But while unrestricted submarine warfare did not bring Britain on her knees, as Germany hoped, it brought the United States into the war. In March five American ships were sunk, and in April America declared war on Germany. The American men-of-war immediately helped Britain in tightening the blockade on the German coast which resulted in the slow starvation of the German people.

But the entrance of America was accompanied by the exit of Russia from the war. Early in March revolution broke out in Petrograd, the capital city of Russia, and the mighty Tsar abdicated on the 15th. The provisional Government set up by Kerensky found it impossible to carry on the War. In the meanwhile the Russian revolutionaries, living abroad, were secretly brought back by Germany to their native land in sealed carriages. One of them, Lenin, leader of the Bolshevik Party, lost no time in bringing about a Communist revolution and commenced negotiations with the Germans for ending hostilities.

In the western front the French offensive on the Aisne and the British offensive at Passchendaele, in the Ypres sector, both ended in costly failure. The battle of Passchendaele has been described as the crowning horror of the war on the western front. It continued from July to November and the British gained a few thousand yards of useless ground at the cost of 300,000 casualties.

While the Germans were merely on the defensive on the western front, they took the offensive against Italy, routed the Italian army and reached within a few miles of Venice. The British and French forces had to be hurried to the scene to save Italy.

The British-Indian army obtained notable success in West-

ern Asia. It re-took Kut, captured Baghdad and pursued the Turkish forces retreating northwards. In Palestine the army captured Beersheba, drove the Turks from Gaza, and captured Jerusalem.

v. Year 1918.

Russia and Rumania concluded peace-treaties with the Central Powers and were thus eliminated from the War. Thereupon Germany decided to deliver a knock-out blow in the western front before the American troops could join the Allies in large number. The Germans broke through the British line on the Allies' left, from Arras to the Oise. The British army was in full retreat and the Germans re-occupied the old Somme battlefield and advanced within ten miles of Amiens. All these took place in the last days of March which were the darkest in the war for Britain. A second German attack in April in the Ypres sector, further north, was equally successful. Armentieres fell, and for a time it was feared that even Ypres might fall, leaving open to the Germans the way to the Channel ports. The third attack in May broke the French line between Rheims and Soissons, and the Germans once more reached the Marne at Chateau-Thierry, within forty miles of Paris.

In the midst of these calamities the French General Foch was placed in supreme command of all the troops—British, French, Italian and American—on the western front. The Germans were exhausted by the great efforts they had made and were short of reserves. Foch's counter-offensive was therefore eminently successful. It began on 18 July with an attack on the advanced German line on the Marne, and forced the enemy to fall back. On 8 August the British army drove back the Germans from the Somme battlefield. The British and the Belgians advanced from Ypres and drove the Germans from the Belgian coast. The overwhelming superiority of the Allies in number of soldiers and guns and tanks, enabled them to advance all along the line in September and October. The Germans were forced to vacate nearly the whole of France and a third of Belgium. About the same time the powers allied with Germany were liquidated one by one. The Bulgarians were

routed in September and their country was occupied, cutting off communications between Germany and Turkey. As the result of a successful drive against the Turks in Palestine, Damascus fell on 2 October, and the British forces pushed forward to Aleppo. The Turks sued for armistice. The Dardanelles were opened. and Constantinople was occupied by Allied troops in October. About the same time the Austrians were defeated on the Italian front and driven back to their territory.

The failure of the last great offensive of Germany, the retreat of her troops from France, the defeat and desertion of her allies, and starvation staring in the face of her people due to the rigorous naval blockade, destroyed the morale of the German people and made them eager for peace. Their military leaders were in favour of continuing the war and their army was still in a position to do so, but they could not be provided with supplies. A revolution was brewing and the German navy mutinied. The military collapse of Austria at this critical moment filled the cup of misery. The Kaiser abdicated and left Germany on 9 November ; and the German Government concluded an armistice on 11 November, 1918. There was also a revolution in Austria and the Austrian Emperor abdicated.

A conference of the representatives of the victorious Allied Powers met at Paris in 1919 to settle the terms of peace. By the treaty of Versailles (1919) Germany was compelled to surrender all her colonies and cede large extent of territories in Europe. She was disarmed, and undertook to pay fantastic reparations, running into thousands of millions. The most humiliating terms imposed upon Germany, and accepted by her under duress, paved the way for the next World War. This was foreshadowed by the German representative who signed the Armistice. He bluntly told the French General, Marshal Foch : "A nation of seventy millions suffers, but does not die."

The Austro-Hungarian Empire was broken up and both Austria and Hungary—now two separate States—had to cede large territories to their neighbours who had backed the right horse.

The only redeeming feature of the Treaty of Peace was the creation of the League of Nations whose covenant was incorporated into it.

3. India's Contribution to the War.

The declaration of war by Great Britain against Germany automatically made India a belligerent and dragged her into the great holocaust. The Indians had, of course, no voice in the matter, and the Government of India did not consult the people, either in declaring war, or in respect of the military assistance rendered to the British empire in the name, and on behalf, of the Indian people. India's contribution, great though it was, cannot, therefore, be regarded as voluntary or even contribution in the proper sense of the term, such as we might apply to the assistance rendered by British Colonies like Australia, New Zealand, etc. Some amount of fraud and deceit were practised both by the Government and the people of India in this matter. The British imperialism thought it politic to hide the real character of the valuable aid obtained from Indian dominions and represent it as magnificent contributions of the Indian people. The people of India knew very well that they had no concern whatsoever with the men, money and materials sent by the Government of India to help the British empire in its hour of peril, that they had no choice or option in the matter, and possessed no power to withhold a single item even if they chose to do so. They, however, made a virtue of necessity by gloating over the contributions as their own, with a view to the bargaining power which they would thereby secure in wringing political concessions from the British as the price of their assistance to Britain in her dire necessity.

Nevertheless, as this fiction of Indian contribution persisted till the end, and played no small part in securing political reforms for India, it is necessary to describe briefly the part played by Indian troops. These comprised 80,000 British officers and men, and about 230,000 Indian ranks, including non-combatants, at the outbreak of the War, together with about 1,200,000 recruited during the War,[6] largely by press-gang methods of terror and violence. One may form some idea of the reckless manner in which Indian troops were sent abroad to fight the imperial war of Britain, from the fact that India "was denuded of troops to such an extent that the British garrison for the space of some weeks stood at a figure of 15,000 men".[7] The

Indian troops were mercilessly sacrificed at the altar of British interest from the very beginning. They were "the only trained reinforcements immediately available in any part of the empire", when the Germans began their offensive against France, and "arrived in time to stem the German thrust towards Ypres and the Channel ports during the autumn of 1914".[8] Instead of the two Divisions and one Cavalry Brigade, which the Government of India had agreed to send overseas, they proceeded to provide at once for France two Infantry and two Cavalry Divisions, accompanied by four Field Artillery Brigades in excess of the normal element.[9] When the Germans had forced back the British army in Flanders and were rapidly advancing on Paris, this Indian army was flung across the road and checked the enemy ; but very few survivors were left of the gallant force. No wonder that the members of the British Parliament sprang to their feet and cheered the news with hot enthusiasm. Verily, England fought to the last Indian.

In September, 1914, a mixed Division was sent to Africa, and this expedition, which was run by the India Office, proved a disastrous failure. The entire campaign in Mesopotamia (1914-18), to which reference has been made above, was conducted by the Government of India under the general supervision of the Home Government. It began with some successes ; the Expeditionary Force captured Amara and Kut-el-Amara and advanced towards Baghdad. But the Indian army was defeated at Ctesiphon, within a few miles of Baghdad, and fell back upon Kut (December, 1915). The pursuing Turks besieged the town and the Indian army surrendered on 29 April, 1916, after a siege of 147 days. It was evident by that time that the Mesopotamian expedition was hopelessly mismanaged by the Government of India, and early in February, 1916, the War Office in England took charge of the expedition. In July, 1916, when Lloyd George took charge of the War Office, the administration of matters connected with the expedition was transferred to the control of the Home Government.

A Commission was appointed in August, 1916, "to make an investigation into the muddle and its causes," and submitted its report in May, 1917. Lloyd George reflected the general opinion—both official and non-official—when he observed :

"The facts revealed by this Commission's report cast a baleful light upon the mismanagement, stupidity, criminal neglect and amazing incompetence of the military authorities who were responsible for the organization of the expedition, and on the horrible and unnecessary suffering of the gallant men who were sent to failure and defeat through the blunders of those in charge."[10] As will be shown later, the bungling of the Government of India in Mesopotamia had serious repercussions on the British policy on India which reacted more favourably towards the grant of political powers to the Indians.

It is unnecessary to describe in detail the part played by the Indian troops in various theatres of war in which they fought as merely auxiliaries to the British army. They fought in France, Belgium, Egypt, the Sudan, East Africa, the Cameroons, North China, Trans-Caspia, Persia, Mesopotamia, Kurdistan, Gallipoli, Salonika, Palestine and Aden.

India's supply in men, money and material was so large that the Viceroy, Lord Hardinge, declared in the House of Commons, and repeated it in his autobiography, that India had been "bled white" by the War Office. That this was no mere rhetoric would be apparent from a few comparative figures. Prior to the War the normal recruitment of combatants for the Indian army was only about 15,000 a year. In the year ending May, 1917, this had been raised to 121,000, and in the following year ending on the 31st May, 1918, to over 300,000 men. Altogether, during the War 1,161,789 Indians had been recruited, and 1,215,338 men had been sent overseas from India, of whom 101,439 had become casualties.[11] As stated above, sometimes only 15,000 soldiers remained in India, the rest being sent out to fight the battles of Britain.

India had to bear the heavy expenses of maintaining this huge army and even the cost of their transport to the distant theatres of war mentioned above. Not satisfied with all this, India, represented by her British master, made a "free gift" of one hundred million sterling to Britain for conducting her imperial war. This amount exceeded the annual revenue of the Government of India and increased her national debt by thirty per cent. The total war expenditure of the Government of India, up to 31 March, 1918, was about £ 127,800,000 sterling.

In addition, Indian princes and peoples contributed £ 2,100,000 sterling in cash, besides placing at the disposal of the Government of India considerable further sums for the purchase of horses, motors, comforts for troops, etc. In 1917-18 the interest, sinking fund, and other charges in connection with India's 'gift' amounted to 6 million sterling.[12] In is significant to note that the Indian National Congress, in its session at Delhi in December, 1918, passed a resolution requesting the Government to relieve India from the burden of contributing 45 millions sterling for war purposes.

Of the eleven lakhs and more of Indians recruited to the army during the war, quite a large number was forced by the most tyrannical methods adopted by Government officials, which, as Sir Michael O'Dwyer admitted, "amounted almost to conscription". Judges passed strong censure on the methods followed "to raise the war-loan and to find recruits." A quota of recruits and war-loan was fixed for each district in the Panjab, and woe befell the officers who failed to achieve the target. No wonder that they put the unfortunate people to the heaviest oppression in order to make them agree to subscribe to the war loan and join the army. A Government official deposed in the open court that he heard a complaint to the effect that the Tahsildar, whose murder was the subject matter of the trial, made men to stand naked in presence of their women-folk. Even Mrs. Besant, in 1922, when she had become a Moderate of the Moderates, condemned the "harsh and oppressive rule of Sir Michael O'Dwyer, his press-gang methods of recruitment, his forced war-loans and his cruel persecution of all political leaders".[13]

III. REACTION OF THE INDIANS TO THE WORLD WAR I.

Although India was dragged into the war without the consent of her people, there was no public protest or open display of discontent on their part, as was the case twenty-five years later, when the Government of India had similarly joined the Second World War. On the other hand, there was, at least out-

wardly, an effusion of loyal sentiments which found expression in public sympathy with Britain and offer of active support to her in her fight against Germany. The whole of India seemed to be full of enthusiasm for the cause of the Allies, and eager to assist and to co-operate. All this might have been partly genuine as far as the ruling chiefs were concerned, but it would be a grievous mistake to take the words of the common people or their leaders at their face-value. Some of the British writers and statesmen committed this mistake, and wondered why the Government of India did not turn to the best account this universal enthusiasm of the people and desire to serve, by canalising it into voluntary organizations and subsidiary service. They held that it was due to the failure of the Government to do so that the bulk of Indian opinion gradually relapsed into comparative apathy. But the hard-boiled bureaucrats, who ruled India, knew better. A modern hitsorian would undoubtedly endorse their view that there was no real and genuine war-enthusiasm or even loyalty among the people of India. Indeed there can be hardly any doubt that the pious platitudes uttered by Indian leaders indicating the support of, and sympathy with, the British during the First World War, did not represent the real feelings of India. The nationalists and, to a large extent, the general people, did not feel any genuine sympathy for the British in their great trial, and were not really interested in it, except in so far as the situation could be turned to their own advantage. This would be quite evident from the attitude of Tilak, the undisputed leader of the Indian masses, to which reference will be made later. Even the Congress, though vociferous in its manifestation of loyalty, made no secret of the fact that it demanded political reforms as a price of Indian loyalty. This would be evident from the resolution passed by the Congress in 1914 and 1915, declaring that "in view of the profound and avowed loyalty that the people of India have manifested in the present crisis", "the time has arrived to introduce further and substantial measures of reform towards the attainment of Self-Government". On the whole, the general feeling of the Indians may be summed up in the well-known dictum: "England's necessity is India's opportunity".[14] The only notable exception was Gandhi, who was loyal to the British to the core of his heart,

and was genuine in his efforts to help them during the War, without any condition.

The general feeling was strengthened by the high ideals openly expressed by the English and American leaders in defence of their attitude towards Germany. Woodrow Wilson, the President of U.S.A., declared : "We fight for the liberty, the self-government and the undictated development of all peoples. No people must be forced under sovereignty under which it does not wish to live".

When Asquith, the Prime Minister of Britain, vividly described the consequences that would follow the German occupation of Britain, and referred to this "intolerable degradation of a foreign yoke" as inconceivable, his words rang in the ears of the Indians. The next British Prime Minister, Lloyd George, declared that the wishes of the inhabitants must be the supreme consideration in the re-settlement of the German colonies. The leading English and American statesmen repeatedly declared in no uncertain terms that they were waging war "to make the world safe for democracy", and promised the right of self-determination to every nation.

These solemn and liberal declaration did not fall flat on the Indian political leaders.[15] Whether they took them at their face-value may be doubted, but they certainly regarded them as something which they could exploit for serving their own ends. They could easily point out that the demand for Home Rule was nothing more than a fulfilment of the pledges so solemnly given.

There was a general feeling in political circles that some great changes in the constitution of the Government of India were in the offing, and the leaders lost no time in formulating demands in a concrete form. During the September Session (1916) of the Imperial Legislative Council at Simla, nineteen elected Indian members submitted a joint memorandum embodying their views and proposals about reforms.

As will be related in the next section, the extremists were admitted to the Congress after nine years in 1916, and this was follweo by a close alliance between the Congress and the Muslim League. As noted above (p. 312), there was already some kind of rapprochement between the two, and the arrest and detention

of several eminent Muslim leaders for their pro-Turkish activities acted as a further incentive to the Muslim League to come to an understanding with the Congress. The bond of alliance between the two was cemented by their holding the annual sessions in the same place, and about the same time, in 1915 and 1916. Both adopted, and specified in great details, in their annual sessions at Lakhnau held in December, 1916, the self-same demand for reforms, which, if accepted, would give the Indians an effective voice in all branches of the administration of their own country, except military and foreign affairs. The most important feature of the joint scheme was the provision of separate electorates for the Muhammadans, and fixing the number of their seats, both in the Provincial and Imperial Legislative Councils. Save in these two respects there was no substantial difference between the Congress-League joint scheme and the one drawn up by 19 members of the Imperial Legislative Council referred to above (p. 328). By rejecting the latter in favour of the former, the Congress took upon itself the entire responsibility for accepting, in a full measure, undisguised communalism in the Constitution of India. The scheme of the 19 members has thus the unique distinction of being the first as well as the last concrete scheme of reforms, drawn up by he Indians themselves, on a purely national basis.

The Congress-League scheme was hailed as establishing the Hindu-Muslim unity on a solid foundation by solving the knotty problem of the representation of the two communities in the various legislatures. But this result was achieved by accepting communal representation, the principle of weightage, and also communal vote in legislation. Thus the Mlisms gained all the points which were persistently demanded by them and against which the Moderate and Nationalist leaders had hitherto struggled with equal obstinacy, though in vain. The communal electorate stank into the nostrils of these leaders in 1909, and evoked from them fierce denunciations against the British for the insidious poison they had administered into the Indian body politic. But now they swallowed the poison even in greater doses, and committeed political *Harikari*.

Being guided by the idea that Hindu-Muslim unity was indispensable for success, and must therefore be achieved at any

cost, the Congress leaders gambled their whole fortune on one stake, and sacrificed the future for immediate gain. This is the best interpretation that can be put on their action. The wisdom of their venture and the extent of success earned by it are matters of dispute. But no one can doubt, in the light of subsequent events, that the Congress action in 1916 well and truly laid the foundations of Pakistan thirty years later. A compromise on the fundamental issue of Indian nationality, once begun, was bound to lead to further and further compromises till the whole foundation gave way.

All these, however, could not be foreseen at the moment, and the Hindu-Muslim Pact was hailed with delight by all sections of Indians as another milestone in the arduous march towards freedom. The Government of India was more surprised than anybody else, for the Pact seemed to deprive them of the one trump card they held in their hands to stem the tide of Indian nationalism.

IV. HOME RULE MOVEMENT

1. The Genesis

The Nationalists—the so-called Extremists—, after their discomfiture at Surat in 1907, failed to build up any effective organization of their own. This was mainly due to the absence of leaders on account of the imprisonment of Tilak (1908-14) and the retirement of Arabinda from politics (February, 1910), but partly also to the coercive measures adopted by the Government. The force of nationalism unleashed by the *Swadeshi* movement was, however, so great that in spite of lack of organization and the absence of leaders (B. C. Pal and Lajpat Rai were also absent from India for some time) its ideals rapidly spread all over India and effectively undermined people's faith in the Moderates. The release of Tilak (1914) and India's reaction to the War, as noted above, brought the Nationalists into the forefront of Indian politics and set in the process of transfer of power from the Moderates to the Extremists,—a process which was hastened by the terrible loss sustained by the Moderates by the death of their two great lead-

ers, Gokhale and Pherozeshah Mehta, in 1915. But even before this the Congress, led by the old Moderates, had already come to be looked upon as a backwater in politics,—effete and useless in the struggle for freedom. The thoughts of the nationalists had accordingly turned towards setting up a new organization for achieving it, and two great personalities, Mrs. Annie Besant and Bal Gangadhar Tilak, independently conceived the idea of starting Home Rule Movement on the Irish model.

2. Re-entry of the Extremists to the Congress

Tilak was released from prison after serving nearly the full term of six years, and returned to Poona on 16 June, 1914. The political life in India had suffered a great change during this long interval ; it had become dull and inactive and offered a sad contrast to what it was when Tilak was sent to prison. The reversal of the Partition of Bengal and the Morley-Minto reforms had rallied the Moderates to the cause of the Government, and as the Congress was now practically an organization of that Party, it had ceased to evoke popular enthusiasm or public support. All eyes were thereore turned to Tilak whose enforced absence for six years was regarded by many as the principal cause of the lethargy and inertia which had come over the political life of India.

This brought to the forefront the question of re-admitting the Extremists to the Congress. There was a general feeling among both the Moderates and the Extremists—except the die-hard section in both the camps—that the best interest of the country demanded that the Extremists should be admitted to the Congress so that it might once again become what its name implies,, namely the Indian National Congress, and not continue to be a mere Party organization.

Tilak strongly held this view. He never desired to wreck the Congress, and always expressed his desire that the Congress, as a representative of all political views, must continue to function as the chief political organ and spokesman of the nation. Almost all the Moderate leaders, with the notable exception of Pherozeshah Mehta, favoured the re-admission of the Extremists into the Congress. When, in 1912, Pherozeshah deprecated the

idea in strong language and suggested instead that "each set of distinct convictions should have its separate Congress", even the *Bengalee* of Calcutta, edited by Surendra Nath Banerji, the great Moderate leader, felt constrained to make the following comment: "Sir Pherozeshah Mehta has described the desire for a united Congress as mawkish sentimentality. We regret that he should have used this language in relation to a widespread and deep-seated sentiment which inspires the political world of Bengal.....Bengal feels that a sectional Congress is not a National Congress and that a sectional Congress has no right to speak in the name of the nation. If the non-conventionalists are willing to accept the creed and fight under the constitutional standard for the attainment of the goal which is perfectly constitutional, their exclusion from he Congress would be unjustifiable and there is no reason why their legitimate demands should not be sympathetically considered."[16]

After the release of Tilak, Mrs. Annie Besant, who had recently joined active politics, seriously took up the question and, accompanied by Subba Rao Pantulu, saw both Gokhale and Tilak at Poona, early in December, 1914. An agreement was reached and Mrs. Besant proceeded to Madras in order to place before the Congress, at its ensuing session, the draft resolution prepared by Gokhale himself on the subject. But when it was placed before the Subjects Committee, the President, Bhupendra Nath Bose, stated that he had received a confidential letter from Gokhale opposing the re-entry of the Extremists into the Congress on the ground that Tilak "had openly avowed his intention of adopting boycott of Government and obstructionist methods of the Irish if and after he entered the Congress" In reply to a telegraphic inquiry Tilak flatly denied the allegation of boycotting the Government and pointed out that the Nationalists, with his full support, were still serving in the Municipalities and Legislative Councils. But the mischief was done and the Congress, as it was then constituted, dared not defy the views of Gokhale and Mehta. So the question was referred to a committee.

Gokhale's action led to a fierce and unseemly controversy in which many hard words were said on both sides. While it was still going on, Gokhale passed away on 19 February, 1915.

Much has been said to account for the failure of the efforts for compromise, but the general position seems to be quite clear. Gokhale had agreed to the readmission of the Extremists under the impression that Tilak and his followers had revised their old views and were now prepared to accept the aims and methods of the Moderate Party. But he realized (or probably Mehta made him do so), that this was not true, and gave expresion to it in the following words in his confidential letter referred to above: "Mr. Tilak has told Mr. Subba Rao frankly and in unequivocal terms that he.....does not believe in the present methods of the Congress, which rest on association with Government where possible, and opposition to it where necessary. In place of these he wants to substitute the method of opposition to Government pure and simple within constitutional limits—in other words a policy of Irsh obstruction." It is evident that Gokhale did not fairly represent Tilak's views. To the end of his life Tilak recommended the policy of responsive co-operation, which means exactly what was claimed by Gokhale to be the method of the Congress, namely, association with Government where possible, and opposition to it where necessary. But the real difference between the Moderates and the Extremists lay in drawing the line of demarcation between circumstances which would make association or co-operation with Government possible and desirable, and those which would make opposition necessary. The Morley-Minto reforms, for example, were put in the first category by the Moderates and in the second category by the Extremists.

The opposition of the Moderates to the re-entry of the Extremists into the Congress was not, thererfore, based on any general principle, as defined by Gokhale, but was mainly due to the fundamental difierence between the two Parties as regards goal and method, to which reference has been made above. (pp. 165-70).

But another point of difference, more real and of recent origin, was also referred to by Gokhale in his confidential letter. "Mr. Tilak', he said, "wants to address only one demand to the Government here and to the British public in Engalnd, viz., for the concession of self-government to India, and till that is conceded, he would urge his countrymen to have nothing to do with

either the public services or Legislative Councils ~~and~~ local and municipal bodies", reforms of which practically monopolized the attention of the Congress. Gokhale's statement is fully corroborated by what Tilak himself said when inaugurating Home Rule Movement. He observed "that the days for making miscellaneous demadns were over. Home Rule covered all their demands. It meant political power to implement reforms and so, that demand alone should be made on the British Parliament and the British public.' Such a campaign, Gokhale knew, would completely bypass the Congress and leave it high and dry. Even if the campaign were carried on inside the Congress, it would bring to an end, directly or indirectly, the entire structure of the Indian National Congress as conceived by its founders and their legitimate successors, the Moderates.

Tilak made no secret of the fact that one of his objects to seek admission into the Congress was to induce men of progressive views to attend its sessions in larger numbers and thereby to get his programme sanctioned by that body. This was quite a legitimate desire and in strict accordance with democratic procedure. But any far-sighted statesman in touch with the political currents of the time could cleraly see that once Tilak was inside the Congress he would easily convert it to the Extremist programme, and in any case the old quarrel between the two Parties would be revived, perhaps in a more virulent form. The only way to prevent this 'calamity' was to keep the door of the Congress closed to Tilak, Pherozeshah Mehta, a much shrewder man than Gokhale, clearly perceived all this and was hence opposed from the very beginning to any negotiation with Tilak. There can be little doubt that it was his influence which changed the attitude of Gokhale on the eve of the Madras Congress. For, Tilak's attitude, including Subba Rao's version of it, must have been known to him when he drafted the compromise resolution. It is, therefore, difficult to avoid the conclusion that Gokhale was technically at fault in going back upon his word at the last moment without justifiable grounds. At the same time it should be conceded that the apprehensions of both Gokhale and Mehta about the impact of Tilak's entry into the Congress, as stated above, were fully justified by subsequent events. We may therefore take a more charitable view of Gokhale's conduct

by holding that he merely put the interests of his Party, which he believed to be also those of the country, above his personal honour and reputation.

The death of Gokhale hushed all controversy for the time being, but the question was revived in the Provincial Conference of the Nationalists held at Poona on 8 May, 1915, under the Chairmanship of Joseph Baptista. Tilak declared himself to be unreservedly in favour of rejoining the Congress if its rules were so modified that the delegates to the Congress might be elected by public meetings. But some of his followers did not agree with him. They held that it was a humiliation to rejoin the congress whence they were ignominiously driven away. They also thought that the association with the Moderates would be a disservice to the country, as they would always seek to check their progressive nationalist ideas and act as a spoke in the wheel of their forward movement. So a Committee was appointed to consider the matter in all its aspects, and its report favouring re-entry into the Congress was placed before the next Conference of the Nationalists at Belgaum held on 27-29 April. Tilak moved a resolution for accepting the terms of compromise offered by the All-India Congress Committee which allowed all nationalist societies, accepting Article I of the Congress creed, to send fifteen delegates each to the Congress. Though the limitation in number was unsatisfactory, Tilak urged the Conference to accept the compromise and said: "If we are there in future, I have not the slightest doubt that this limitation will be removed. Will you wait outside until it is removed, or will you go in and get it removed?" To those who were still opposed to re-entry into the Congress Tilak made an appeal not to split the Congress, but to make this "traditional and influential organ of Indian nationalism more progressive, more militant, more active—active all the year round' (and not for three days only). Though not fully convinced by Tilak's arguments, the dissenting members responded to Tilak's appeal. The resolution supporting entry into the Congress was unanimously passed and a Committee was appointed to take necessary steps in the matter.

While Tilak's view in favour of re-entry into the Congress was accepted by his followers, the opposition of the Moderates to the proposal was considerably weakened by the death of

Pherozeshah Mehta shortly before the session of the Congress in Bombay in 1915. So it amended the constitution of the Congress in order to enable the Extremists to be enrolled as members without in any way sacrificing their principles According to the amended article the delegates of the Indian National Congress were henceforth to be elected by "a meeting convened under the auspices of any association which is of not less than two years' standing on December 31, 1915, and which has for one of its objects the attainment of self-government within the British Empire by constitutional means." The number of delegates from any constituency was fixed at fifteen.

The Congress session at Lakhnau in 1916 has justly been regarded as a landmark in Modern Indian history. For the first time after 1907 the Extremists or Nationalists attended the session of the Congress. A "Home Rule Special" carried Tilak and his party to Lakhnau and they received unique ovations all along the way. Tilak received a right royal reception at Lakhnau. The tyres of his car were cut in order to force the Reception Committee to put him in a carriage which was unhorsed and dragged through the streets amid the wild acclamation of a huge procession. When he arrived at the pandal of the Congress, he was carried by his admirers on their shoulders, and when he rose to speak, he was greeted with deafening cheers.

3. Mrs Annie Besant

Mrs. Annie Besant was born in London in 1847. Her mother and paternal grandmother were Irish, and she used to say that "three-quarters of my blood and all my heart are Irish". She joined the Theosophical Society in 1889, settled in India in 1893, and became the President of the Society in 1907. She had at first devoted herself to the cause of social and educational uplift of the Indians, but gradually came to realize that no real improvement was possible without raising the political status of India. There is no doubt that her 'Irish blood and Irish heart' was also partially responsible for this drift into a fight against British rule.

Mrs. Besant's entry into Indian politics was heralded by the publication of a weekly Review, *The Commonweal*, on 2 January,

1914. The paper adopted as its cardinal programme, religious liberty, national education, social reform and political reform aiming at self-government for India within the British Commonwealth.[16] In 1914 Mrs. Besant went to England to try to form an Indian party in the Parliament. The attempt failed, but she roused sympathy for the cause of India by her public address, declaring that "the price of India's loyalty is India's freedom." She conducted propaganda in England in favour of granting self-government to India. She also set up a Home Rule League and addressed a crowded meeting in the Queen's Hall, London, in the spring of 1914.[17] On her return to India she brought a daily paper in Madras, renamed it *New India*, and pulbished it on July 14, the date of the fall of the Bastille.[18] In September, 1915, she made a speech at Bombay pleading India's case for Home Rule or self-government in which she said: "I mean by self-government that the country shall have a government by councils, elected by all the people, elected with power of the purse, and the government is responsible to the House. Then I mean that there should be an elected element in the Imperial Council and that the Government there—the holders of portfolios—shall be responsible to the elected House with the power of the purse in the hands of the representatives of the people. I mean that in the provinces, provincial parliaments also shall be wholly elected with the Ministry responsible to the Parliament, and that the Governor shall act, as the King acts in England, his power being limited."

Ten days later, she made a formal announcement about the Home Rule League in her paper, *New India* (dated September 25, 1915). "After conversation in India and correspondence with England, which have been going on for many months, and the beginning of which goes back to discussions held last year with some English politicians and sympathisers with India, it has been decided to start a Home Rule League, with 'Home Rule for India' as its only object, as an auxiliary to the National Congress here and its British Committee in England, the special function of the Committee being to edueate the English democracy in relation to India, and to take up the work which Charles Bradlaugh began and which was prematurely struck out of his hands by death." She moved a resolution, embodying her ideas,

in the Bombay Congress (1915), but it was ruled out by the President on the ground that it contravened Article I of the Congress Constitution which restricted the scope of the demand for self-government by the words "bringing about a steady reform of the existing system of administration." In the end it was decided that a draft scheme should be prepared by the All-India Congress Committee after consulting other bodies. Mrs. Besant, having agreed to abide by the decision of the All-India Congress Committee, postponed formation of the League. But many of her supporters were in favour of launching the scheme of Home Rule without delay.

The Moderates did not really like the idea of the Home Rule League, for they felt "that such an organization would serve to overlap and perhaps weaken the Congress." Long after it was founded Surendra Nath Banerji wrote:—

"I must say that the League served to create the first division in the Congress camp after the reunion. I did not join it, nor did many of the ex-Presidents of the Congress. I incurred some unpopularity.....I had helped to build up the Congress. It was a part of my life work, my pride and my privilege, and it was not in me to do aught which, in my opinion, would weaken its influences or the great position which it occupied in the estimation of the country."[18]

So the Moderates did nothing to give effect to the resolution of the Bombay Congress. The draft Home Rule scheme which was to be prepared by the All-India Congress Committee before Septetmber 1, 1916, having not been produced by that date, Mrs. Besant now considered herself absolved of the undertaking, and decided to organize the Home Rule League on a regular basis. It was formally inaugurated in September, 1916, and within a few days, branches were formed at Bombay, Kanpur, Allahabad Banaras, Mathura, Calicut, Ahmadnagar, Madras, etc.

Mrs. Besant now began an active propaganda by personal addresses and through her two organs, *New India* and *Commonwealth*. She took full advantage of the ready-made organization of the Theosophical Society with its branches all over India and

even outside, as well as of the personal devotion and admiration felt for her intellect, learning and religious mission by a wide circle of Indians. She set up Home Rule organisations all over the country, made extensive tours, delivered stirring addresses and distributed vast quantities of propagandist literature. She was nothing, if not extraordinary, in whatever she took up, and her short period of political activity of less than five years was marked by an "indomitable will, concentrated purposefulness, undaunted courage, and indefatigable zeal." Her superb oratory and matchless literary gifts enabled her to reach the foremost rank in politics in an incredibly short time. Even the Moderates, who detested her most, admitted that "she stirred the country by the spoken as well as the written word as scarcely anyone else could do."[19]

Many eminent leaders such as Motilal Nehru and Tej Bahadur Sapru joined the Home Rule League of Mrs. Besant, and even decided to set her up as the candidate for the post of President of the ensuing Congress to be held at Lakhnau (1916). It is said that the Raja of Mahmudabad promised to contribute one lakh of Rupees towards the expenses of the Home Rule Deputation to England if Mrs. Besant was elected President. But the movement failed, though it was crowned with success next year.

4. Bal Gangadhar Tilak

In the meantime Tilak had also taken up the idea of Home Rule League. The question was first mooted by J. Baptista in his Presidential Address at the Poona Conference held on 8 May, to which reference has been made above. While welcoming Tilak's re-entry into active politics after six years, he suggested that the World War offered a suitable opportunity to the Indians to demand Home Rule while helping the Government to prosecute it to a successful end. Tilak, who had been thinking in the same line, henceforth concentrated his attention upon this along with the question of re-entry of the Extremists into the Congress which was also discussed at the same Conference, as mentioned above.

As, unlike Mrs. Besant, Tilak was as yet outside the fold of the Congress, he could give effect to his ideas without any reference to that body or without any deference to its desire or decision. He, therefore, summoned a Conference of the Nationalists of Bombay, Central Provinces, and Berar at Poona on December 23 and 24, 1915. i.e. just before the Bombay session of the Congress which scuttled Mrs. Besan's Home Rule scheme. The Conference appointed a Committee of fifteen to determine whether it was desirable to establish a League to obtain Home Rule for India and what steps should be taken with this object in view. The Committee reported in favour of a pioneer organization for Bombay, C.P., and Berar, but suggested that the formation of an all-India League should be postponed till arrangements could be made to establish affiliated provincial organizations in all or nearly all the Provinces of India. The report of the Committee was placed before the Belgaum Conference held on 27-29 April, referred to above. On the basis of this report the Conference resolved to establish the Indian Home Rule League, its object being "to attain Home Rule or Self-Government within the British Empire by all constitutional means and to educate and organise public opinion in the country towards the attainment of the same". The League was accordingly established on 28 April, 1916, with Joseph Baptista as President and N. C. Kelkar as Secretary. The members included G. S. Khaparde, B. S.Moonje, and R. P. Karandikar. Tilak did not accept any office. There was a definite understanding that the Provincial Conference and the Indian Home Rule League would remain two distinct bodies.

In a leading article in the *Mahratta*, explaining the reasons why it became necessary to bring the League into existence, Tilak said:

"It was generally recognized that the time had positively come for an organization to be started for educating public opinion and agitating for Home Rule throughout the country. The Congress was the body which naturally possessed the greatest authority for undertaking such a work with responsibility. The scheme of self-government which the Congress is supposed to be intending to hatch, served as a plausible excuse for most of the Moderates to negative a definite proposal to establish a

Home Rule League. But the Congress, it is generally recognized, is too unwieldy to be easily moved to prepare a scheme for self-government and actively work for its practical success. The spade work has got to be done by someone. It can afford to wait no longer. The League may be regarded as a pioneer movement and is not intended in any sense to be an exclusive movement."

Week after week Tilak wrote stirring articles in his two weeklies, urging for Home Rule. He argued that even when war was going on in all its fierceness at a distance of a hundred miles, Home Rule for Ireland was being discussed in England, and suggested that Home Rule for India should be demanded without waiting for the termination of the war. He asked for a time limit to be laid down in a Parliamentary Bill within which India should be given full self-government. He said: "All are demanding *Swaraj* now, and the British can no longer resist the demand."

About the middle of 1916, Tilak undertook an extensive lecture tour for instructing masses on Home Rule and exhorting them to become members of the Home Rule League. He explained Home Rule as a form of Government within the British Empire in which the rule of the bureaucracy will be replaced by an administration responsible to the people. He appealed mainly to the masses and spoke to them in homely language with simple illustrations, such as could easily bring home to them the idea of self-government. At the same time he took good care to explain that their quarrel was not with the Emperor. Here is one specimen of his talk: "Who rules India? Does the Emperor come and do it? It is carried on through servants like Viceroy, Governor, Collector.....If it be said that the present Governor or Collector is not wanted and another should be brought, would that constitute sedition? Do we say, drive away the English Government?.....Does the Emperor lose anything whether the administration is carried on by the civil servants or by our Belvi Sahib? The rule still remains, the Emperor still remains." He posed the questions: "Why do we ask for *Swarajya*? Are we fit for it?" and answered; "We want only this one thing today. When this one is got, the remaining things come into our possession themselves.....Why

are we not fit (for (*Swarajya*)? Have we no nose, no eyes, no ears, no intellect? Can we not write, have we not read books, can we not ride a horse? You bring from England a new man of 21 years as Collector. Has he any experience at all? He at once becomes the superior of a Mamlatdar of 60 years' experience who gets Rs. 150 to 400 a year and has to stand before the young man."

Again, "The British say that we are not fit and they have come to teach us. But how long will you teach us? For one generation, for two generations, or three generations? Is there any end to this? Or must we, just like this, work under you like slaves till the end?"

Tilak's homely speeches and direct appeals made him not only popular but a hero among the masses. He earned the epithet *Loka-manya* (revered by the people), and was almost worshipped as a God. Wherever he went, he received a right royal reception. He appealed to the people "to imbibe the virtues of patriotism, fearlessness and sacrifice, and held out the national hero Shivaji as their model."

The service done by the Home Rule Leagues is best shown by the contrast which it offered to the degenerate spirit of loyalty which seized the Congress, illustrated by the Presidential speeches in the two sessions of the Congress held at Madras in 1914 and at Bombay in 1915. The effusions of loyalty shown in the first is almost sickening. The President, Bhupendranath Basu, referring to the World War remarked: "In this hour of danger the cry has come from every part of India — from all communities and classes — for a rush to the front", oblivious of the autocratic and terrorist methods by which even the martial Punjabis had to be forcibly recruited to join the army. S. P. Sinha, the President of the Bombay Session in 1915, not only gave vent to similar effusions of loyalty, but went a step further when he said: "Even if the English nation were willing to make us an immediate free gift of full self-government, I take leave to doubt whether the boon would be worth having as such, for it is a commonplace of politics that nations like individuals must grow into freedom, and nothing is so baleful in political institutions as prematurity; nor must we forget that India free can never be ancient India restored."

These silly effusions may be taken as a fair measure of the depth of degradation to which Congress politics had sunk after the expulsion of the Extremists. A comparison of these speeches with the Presidential address of Annie Besant shows the extent to which the political ideals of India had in 1917 advanced by the Home Rule Movement and the re-entry of the Extremists or Nationalists into the Congress. Contrast, for example, the above loyal effusions with the following extracts from Mrs. Besant's Presidential Address at the Calcutta session of the Congress in 1917 : "Early in the War, I ventured to say that the War could not end until England recognised that autocracy and bureaucracy must perish in India as well as in Europe." Again, "the condition of India's loyalty is India's freedom." "India demands Home Rule.....because Freedom is the birthright of every Nation."

While the Home Rule agitation was being carried by Tilak, he wrote: Even when war is going on in all its fierceness at a distance of a hundred miles, Home Rule for Ireland is being discussed in England. We think that Home Rule should be demanded all at once. It need not come into force immediately. A time-limit may be laid down in a Parliament Bill accepting it. Do not ask for crumbs ; ask for the whole bread."[19a]

A comparison between this and the two Addresses of the Congress Presidents referred to above would give a fair idea of the difference between the Congress and the Home Rule Movement. With the fervour of a young man, Tilak himself made hurricane tours, delivered speeches, and week after week wrote articles in his papers in this strain. Five or six weeks after the foundation of the Home Rule League Tilak set himself to the task of drafting a "Bill for the Better Administration of India."

It would be hardly an exaggeration to say that the Home Rule Movement re-awakened the true spirit of Indian politics generated by the Swadeshi Movement after it had sunk into torpor during the seven years of Moderate Party's domination over the Indian National Congress.

5. Joint Efforts of Tilak and Besant.

Although there were two Home Rule Leagues, of Besant and Tilak, they acted in close co-operation. There was an in-

formal understanding between them that Mrs. Besant's field of work would cover the whole of India except the Provinces of Bombay and C. P. where Tilak's League would carry on the work.

The wrath of the Government now fell on the devoted heads of Tilak and Mrs. Besant. It is the peculiar mentality of Indian bureaucracy to ignore the underlying causes and strength of a public movement, but to look upon one or more persons as solely responsible for it. So they tried to muzzle the two leaders as the best way to crush the movement. In July, 1916, a case was instituted against Tilak for certain seditious speeches he delivered at the Home Rule meetings. He was found guilty and ordered to furnish a personal bond of Rs. 20,000 with two sureties of Rs. 10,000 each, to be of good behaviour for a period of one year. About the same time a security of Rs. 2,000 was demanded from *New India*, the daily paper of Mrs. Besant. It was forfeited on August 28, and a new security of Rs. 10,000 was levied. The Bombay High Court set aside the order against Tilak, but Mrs. Besant's appeal was rejected both by the Madras High Court and the Privy Council. Mrs. Besant sold the two presses where her two papers were printed. She also suspended the publication of *New India* on June 18, but it re-appeared three days later under another editor. These pin-pricks did not cripple the activities either of Tilak or of Mrs. Besant, both of whom continued their activities with redoubled vigour. The unwearied activities of Mrs. Besant, Tilak and their associates propagated the idea of Home Rule far and wide, and made it practically the only live issue in Indian politics. The movement had its repercussion on the Indian National Congress and infused it with new strength and vgour. This is clearly proved by a comparison of the Presidential Address in the annual session of the Congress at Bombay in December, 1915, and the resolution on Reform passed by it, with the Presidential Address and the Congress-League scheme adopted in 1916 at Lucknow.

After the conclusion of the Congress session in 1916, Tilak and Besant visited many parts of India, and these visits were referred to in police reports as "triumphant tours". Largely attended meetings were addressed by them and many leaders who had hitherto belonged to the Moderate Party joined the

Nationalists in welcoming them. A large number of branches of the Home Rule League were established all over India.

The Home Rule Movement spread like wildfire. Two characteristic features of it were the participation of women and the religious colouring given to it, as in the case of *Swadeshi* movement in Bengal. Mrs. Besant referred to it as follows in her Presidential Address in the Calcutta Congress (1917): "The strength of the Home Rule Movement is rendered tenfold greater by the adhesion to it of large numbers of women, who bring to its helping the uncalculating heroism, the endurance, and the self-sacrifice of the feminine nature. Our League's best recruits and recruiters are among the women of India, and the women of Madras boast that they marched in procession when the men were stopped, and that their prayers in the temples set the interned captives free. Home Rule has become so intertwined with religion by the prayers offered up in the great Southern Temples — sacred places of pilgrimage — and spreading from them to village temples, and also by its being preached, up and down the country, by *Sadhus* and *Sannyasins*, that it has become in the minds of the women and of the ever-religious masses, inextricably intertwined with religion. That is, in this country, the surest way of winning alike the women of the higher classes and the men and women villagers. And that is why I have said that the two words, "Home Rule", have become a *Mantram*."

It was not long before the Government realized the intensity of the movement. On January 17, 1917, the Home Member of the Government of India wrote in a confidential report: "The position is one of great difficulty. Moderate leaders can command no support among the vocal classes who are being led at the heel of Tilak and Besant."[20] He therefore expressed his opinion that the Moderates should be placated by an early sanction of the reform proposals already made to the Secretary of State (which recommended greater Indianisation of the local bodies and increase of Indian element in the Legislatures).

But, true to the policy of reform-cum-repression, the Home Member continued: "In the meantime.....we must rest content with proceeding against violent language". As regards Mrs. Besant and Tilak the Home Member remarked: "Everybody knows that the former is influenced by the passionate desire of

a vain old lady to be a leader of movements, and the latter (i.e. Tilak) by the venom of hatred against everything British". A circular letter was issued on the 20th March, 1917, advising the Local Governments to warn all men of light and leading to dissociate themselves from the Home Rule campaign, because no reforms likely to be granted by the British Government "can bear resemblance to the extravagant demands for the grant of early Home Rule to India." The Bombay Government wrote to the Government of India that some check should be put upon the movement. They had prohibited Mrs. Besant from entering into Bombay, and as their last attempt to curb the activities of Tilak failed, proposed to take further measures against him. The Government of C. P. also externed Mrs. Besant; while Tilak and B. C. Pal were prohibited by the Governments of the Punjab and Delhi from entering into their jurisdiction. Lord Pentland, Governor of Madras, warned the people against the extravagant demands of Home Rule, and uttered a threat which was soon followed by action. On 15 June, 1917, the Government of Madras issued orders of internment against Mrs. Besant and her two co-workers, G. S. Arundale and B. P. Wadia, and externed Karandikar and Marathe. The effect of all this on political India was just the opposite of what was intended.

The Government's determined hostility against the Home Rule Leagues, and evident desire to declare them illegal associations, stirred the whole country to its depth. Sir Subrahmaniya Aiyar, recognized throughout India as an eminent lawyer, boldly stood forward as the champion of the Home Rule Leagues. He declared that he would stand by them even if the Government declared them illegal, and was prepared to suffer any punishment that would be meted out to him for that offence. It was apprehended that the Government of Bombay would follow in the footsteps of Madras, and the example of Subrahmaniya Aiyar was followed in Bombay and C. P. More than two thousand persons, including many men of light and leading, pledged themselves to stand by the Home Rule League if it was declared illegal.

The internment of Mrs. Besant was adversely criticized even in Britain and other foreign countries. A storm of indignation swept India from one end to the other. Protest meetings

were held all over the country, and many of those nationalist leaders, who had hitherto stood aloof, joined the Home Rule Leagues and actively participated in their campaigns. Even the placidity of the Congress was disturbed. Under the inspiration of Tilak the All-India Congress Committee made a vigorous protest to the Viceroy against the repressive and reactionary policy, and asked for an official declaration accepting the political demands of the Indians. They also asked for the release of Mrs. Besant and her associates. They placed on record their appreciation of the work carried on by the Home Rule Leagues, and as a mark of it, elected Mrs. Besant President of the Congress Session in 1917. As a matter of fact Mrs. Besant and her associates in prison served the cause of Home Rule far better than if they had been free.

The Home Rule Leagues were making rapid strides. At the end of the first year Tilak's League alone had 14,000 members with an income of about Rs. 16,000. In winding up the first annual Conference of the League, held at Nasik on 17-18 May, 1917, Tilak emphasized the role of the League and its difference from the Congress. The latter, he said, was merely a deliberative body whose only or main function was to pass pious resolutions. The Home Rule League, on the other hand, is pledged to work zealously throughout the year for the sole object of achieving Home Rule. He did not thank those who wished the League a long life, but would prefer that the League be dissolved in two years after the grant of Home Rule to India.

After the annual Conference was over, the workers redoubled their efforts to carry the Home Rule propaganda to the villagers. The local officials sent alarming reports of their seditious teachings and the Government of India were urged by Local Governments to take strong measures. The Viceroy, being impressed by the strength and popularity of the movement, put a brake on their ardour, but apprised the Secretary of State of the real situation in India. While doing so, he observed: "Mrs. Besant, Tilak and others are fomenting with great vigour the agitation for immediate Home Rule, and in the absence of any definite announcement by Government of India as to their policy in the matter, it is attracting many of those who hitherto have held less advanced views. The agitation is

having a mischievous effect on public feeling throughout the country."

The Home Rule League was equally anxious that the Government would publicly declare their policy. In England, Lord Pentland had ridiculed the idea of Home Rule in a public speech. Tilak took up the challenge and advised the Congress organizations all over India not only to make vigorous protests, but also to get up a monster petition urging upon the Secretary of State to grant Home Rule to India. There was already a suggestion to resort to Passive Resistance in order to secure the release of Mrs. Besant, and Tilak now proposed to broad-base it on the main political issue of Home Rule.

Events now moved at railway speed. A joint meeting of the All-India Congress Committee and of the Council of the Muslim League was convened on July 29, 1917. "On the question of adopting Passive Resistance, both as regards its principle and working, in carrying, on political work, it was resolved to request the Provincial Congress Committees and the Council of the Muslim League to consider its advisability and to send their opinion to the General Secretaries within six weeks. The Joint Committee also recorded its strong protest against the high-handed action of the Government of Bengal in prohibiting the public meeting which was to be held in Calcutta, under the Presidentship of Dr. Rash Bihari Ghosh, to protest against the internment of Mrs. Besant and Messrs. Arundale and Wadia, and trusted that the people of Bengal will use every lawful means to vindicate their rights."

"The proposal for adopting Passive Resistance was seriously considered by the various Provincial Congress Committees in the months of August and September, 1917, and while Berar considered it advisable, and Bombay, Burma and the Punjab advised postponement in view of Mr. Montagu's expected visit to India, U. P. considered it inadvisable "in the existing situation". Bihar thought that "a date must be fixed within which the release of the Home Rule internees as well as of the Ali Brothers and Moulana Abul Kalam Azad should be demanded; Bihar would herself intensify the demand by repeating it from different platforms, and failing redress, the public men of the Province shall betake themselves to actively preaching Passive Resistance to the

people and be prepared to suffer all sacrifices and privations that it may involve." The Madras Provincial Congress Committee approved of the idea on the 14th August, 1917, in a resolution which we quote below:—

"Resolved that, in the opinion of the Madras Provincial Congress Committee, it is advisable to adopt the policy of Passive Resistance in so far as it involves opposition to all unjust and unconstitutional orders against the carrying on of constitutional agitation, and also against the prohibition of public meeting peacefully and costitutionally conducted, to protest against the unjust and unconstituional orders of internment and against the repressive policy of Government."

"It was further resolved that 'a sub-committee be appointed to formulate and report within a fortnight on the practical steps by which effect may be given to the resolution of Passive Resistance adopted this day'. In the city of Madras a pledge was drafted, and Sir S. Subrahmaniya Aiyar, retired Judge and Acting Chief Justice of the Madras High Court, Honorary President of the All-India Home Rule League, and an old Congressman, was the first to sign the pledge. The next to sign the pledge was Mr. S. Kasturi Ranga Iyengar, Editor of *The Hindu*"[21] Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar, who was a very prominent leader, also signed the pledge after some hesitation and delay. Younger men then signed the pledge.

Six days after the Madras Provincial Congress Committee passed the resolution in favour of Passive Resistance, Mr. E. S. Montagu, the new Secretary of State for India, made his historic pronouncement declaring Responsible Government as the goal of British policy in India and pledging the Government that substantial steps should be taken in this direction as soon as possible. There can be hardly any doubt that the pronouncement was the direct result of the Home Rule Movement and Viceroy's communication on the subject to the Secretary of State mentioned above. In any case Montagu's statement altered the whole political situation. "There was again a joint session of the All-India Congress Committee and the Council of the Muslm League on the 6th October at Allahabad, at which there was a general consensus of opinion that the question of Passive Resistance should be dropped. Mrs. Besant herself was against the idea of

Passive Resistance, but the younger men were greatly disappointed at this unexpected termination of an effective programme. The joint meeting, instead of pursuing Passive Resistance, decided upon sending an All-India Deputation to the Viceroy and the Secretary of State, with a reasoned representation in support of the Congress-League scheme. To this end a Committee of twelve was appointed with Mr. C. Y. Chintamani as Secretary to prepare an address and the Memorandum. The deputation waited on Lord Chelmsford and Mr. Montagu in November 1917, with the Memorandum."[22]

Tilak, however, did not suspend or relax the Home Rule agitation. He knew that it was this agitation that had forced the Government to meet the Indian demands half-way, and it was therefore necessary to keep it alive in order to obtain substantial concessions from the Government. The Home Rule Movement became more and more popular and tended to become a mass movement, though within a restricted zone in India. Still more surprising is the fact that even prominent Muslim leaders like Jinnah, and the family of Muhammad Ali joined it. Indeed both the people and the Government now began to look upon Tilak as the live wire in politics and the real leader of India. Tilak's activities after Montagu's statement were described in an official report as follows : "The capture of the Congress organization by Mrs. Besant and Tilak is complete. The moderate Party in the Congress is extinguished. The Congress is completely identified with Home Rule". Montagu, after his arrival in India, had an interview with Tilak on 27 November and tried, in vain, to secure the support of Tilak for his Reform proposals. But he wrote in his Diary that Tilak "is at the moment probably the most powerful leader in India, and he has it in his power, if he chooses, to help materially in the war effort. His procession to Delhi to see me was a veritable triumphant one."

There is no doubt that the Home Rule campaign had practically ousted the Moderates from the political field which they had dominated till the return of Tilak to active politics in 1914. Neither Pherozeshah Mehta nor Gokhale could have possibly prevented his re-entry into the Congress even if they were alive, but their anticipations about its effect upon the Congerss pro-

ved to be only too true. This was made quite clear when even with the utmost efforts the Moderate leaders could not prevent the election of Tilak's nominee, Mrs. Besant, as President of the Congress session in 1917, to which reference will be made later. This leader of the Home Rule Movement uttered words, as President, which were never heard before in the Congress pandal. The Moderates, who successfully prevented in the past the election of Tilak and Lajpat Rai as Congress President, now failed in the case of Mrs. Besant, and must have read their doom in the applause with which the vast audience greeted the new tone she had introduced in an organization which they had hitherto claimed to be their special citadel.

The Congress session, held in Calcutta in 1917 with Mrs. Besant as the President, was a great triumph for the Home Rule Movement. There was a record gathering—nearly five thousand delegates and equal number of visitors, including four hundred ladies, forming the most significant feature. The general view was that it was "the Congress of Mrs. Besant and Mr. Tilak—of Mrs. Besant more than of Mr. Tilak". Mrs. Besant, with her usual eloquence, made a vigorous plea in her Presidential Address for immediate introduction of a Bill in the British Parliament for the establishment of self-government in India, preferably in 1923 and not later than 1928. She rose to the height of her stature, as the following passages, taken at random from her Address, will show :

"Early in the War, I ventured to say that the War could not end until England recognised that autocracy and bureaucracy must perish in India as well as in Europe. The good Bishop of Calcutta, with a courage worthy of his free race, lately declared that it would be hypocritical to pray for victory over autocracy in Europe and to maintain it in India."

"I once said in England : "The condition of India's loyalty is India's freedom". I may now add : "The condition of India's usefulness to the Empire is India's freedom."

"It is said to be an epoch-making event that "Indian Representatives" took part in the Conference. Representatives they were, but, as said, of the British Government in India, not of India, whereas their colleagues represented their Nations."

"India demands Home Rule for two reasons : one essen-

tial and vital, the other less important but weighty. First, because Freedom is the birthright of every Nation ; secondly, because her most important interests are now made subservient to the interests of the British Empire without her consent, and her resources are not utilised for her greatest needs. It is enough only to mention the money spent on her Army, not for local defence but for Imperial purposes, as compared with that spent on primary education."

"It is not a question whether the rule is good or bad. German efficiency in Germany is far greater than English efficiency in England ; the Germans were better fed, had more amusements and leisure, less crushing poverty than the English. But would any Englishman therefore desire to see Germans occupying all the highest positions in England ? Why not ? Because the righteous self-respect and dignity of the free man revolt against foreign domination, however superior. As Mr. Asquith said at the beginning of the War, such a condition was "inconceivable and would be intolerable." Why then is it the one conceivable system here in India ?.....Thank God that India's eyes are opening ; that myriads of her people realise that they are men, with a man's right to manage his own affairs. India is no longer on her knees for boons ; she is on her feet for Rights. It is because I have taught this, that the English in India misunderstand me, and call me seditious ; it is because I have taught this, that I am President of this Congress to-day.

".....And let me say to the Government of India and Britain, with all frankness and good will, that India is demanding her Rights, and is not begging for concessions. It is for her to say with what she will be satisfied.....In this attitude, the Democracy of Great Britain supports us ; the Allies, fighting, as Mr. Asquith said, 'for nothing short of freedom', support us ; the great Republic of the United States of America supports us. Britain cannot deny her own traditions, contradict her own leading statesmen, and shame the free Commonwealth, of which she is the glorious Head in the face of the world."

Never before had the Indian National Congress listened to such sentiments which were first voiced by the nationalists or so-called Extremists during the *Swadeshi* movement. The resolution passed by the Congress in 1917, demanding immediate

legislation for granting self-government within a prescribed period[23], had been the war-cry of the Nationalists during the preceding ten years. So Calcutta, in 1917, reversed the verdict of Surat in 1907. One cannot but admire the political acumen of Morley who wrote to Minto about the Surat fracas : "The news has just come in that the Congress, so far from being "flat" as I expected, has gone to pieces, which is the exact opposite of flat, no doubt. For it means, I suppose, the victory of Extremist over Moderate, going no further at this stage than the break-up of the Congress, but pointing to a future stage in which the Congress will have become an Extremist organisation."[24] The prophecy of Morley was fulfilled ; the Congress had become an Extremist Organization in the course of a decade.

6. Repercussion of Home Rule Movement Outside India.

The appeal of the Home Rule Movement extended far beyond the frontiers of India. The great revolutionary leader Hardayal wrote from Stockholm : "I have become an adherent of the party of Home Rule in India instead of the old Revolutionary Party which aimed at the dissolution of the British Empire in India." Sir Subrahmaniya Aiyar, mentioned above, in his capacity as the President of the Indian Home Rule League, Madras, wrote a letter to President Wilson of U. S. A. which was sent on June 24, 1917, through Mr. and Mrs. Hotchner. It was a moving appeal from which we quote the following :

"An immediate promise of home rule—autonomy—for India would result in an offer from India of at least 5,000,000 men in three months for service at the front, and of 5,000,000 more in another three months. At present we are a subject nation, held in chains, forbidden by our alien rulers to express publicly our desire for the ideals presented in your famous war message ; 'The liberation of peoples, the rights of nations great and small, and the privilege of men everywhere to choose their ways of life and of obedience. The world must be made safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon the tested foundations of political liberty.....The aching heart of India cries out to you, whom we believe to be an instrument of God in the reconstruction of the world.

"Permit me to add that you and the other leaders have been kept in ignorance of the full measure of misrule and oppression in India. Officials of an alien nation, speaking a foreign tongue, force their will upon us ; they grant themselves exorbitant salaries and large allowances ; they refuse us education ; they rob us of our wealth ; they impose crushing taxes without our consent ; they cast thousands of our people into prisons for uttering patriotic sentiments, prisons so filthy that often the inmates die from loathsome diseases."[25]

This letter formed the subject of an interpellation in the House of Commons. In reply Montagu said that the Government of India informed Sir Subrahmaniya Ajyar that they viewed his action with surprise and regret, but that in view of his great age, failing health, and past judicial services they did not propose to take any further action. But Sir Subrahmaniya would be warned that any repetition of such conduct could not again be passed over. Mr. Montagu himself referred to the letter as 'disgraceful'. As a protest against this Sir Subrahmaniya Aiyar renounced his titles of K. C. I. E. and Diwan Bahadur.

The letter of Subrahmaniya Aiyar was given publicity in the American Press. An India Home Rule League was established in New York to support the Home Rule movement in India and America. Its headquarters were at 1465 Broadawy, New York, and it published a monthly journal called *Young India*, whose first issue appeared in July, 1918. The main object of the League was to lay the true conditions of life in India before the outside world which hitherto derived such information from either British sources or Christian missionaries. This object was achieved by the regular publication of Indian news and views in the *Young India* and organization of public meetings all over the United States. An organized campaign of misrepresentation against India's fitness for Home Rule was being carried on in the American Press, and the *Young India* did yeoman's service in exposing the false propaganda carried on by interested parties at the instance of the British.

Tilak strongly felt the need of propaganda in the U.S.A. whose democratic ideals were highly admired in India. Lajpat Rai, with N. S. Hardikar and K. D. Sastri, proceeded there on

behalf of the Home Rule League, a branch of which was established at San Francisco. Hardikar gave the following account of his activities in a letter written to Tilak: "From the 9th of February to the 6th of May (1919), a period of 86 days, I travelled through 20 States of the Union. I gave 83 popular addresses, and arranged 25 different conferences. The conferences were held in ten States and 25 large cities, and were the result of 24 extensive tours. In the cities the audiences ranged from 25 to 3,000. I sold 4,000 copies of 'Self-determination for India,' and 1500 copies of 'Get Together on India'. In all the cities I was received at the principal colleges, and by the chief newspaper proprietors. Going from one place to another to speak, I could only arrange conferences at 25 places, and had to refuse nine invitations". Lajpat Rai also sent Tilak a brief report in which he wrote: "Dr. Hardikar has returned from his tour which was very successful from every point of view. He brought new members, established new branches, and secured also some funds. We have been issuing occasional bulletins to the United States Press, giving them a summary of what we put in the English press."

Tilak wrote in 1918 to M. Clemenceau, President of the Peace Conference, requesting him to solve the Indian problems so that India might "be a leading power in Asia" and "a powerful steward of the League of Nations in the East for maintaining the peace of the world."

A Home Rule for India League was also established in London with headquarters at 1, Robert Street, Adelphi. It worked in co-operation with the British Committee of the Indian National Congress, the Britain and India Association, and United India Society. Representatives of these bodies appointed a 'Consultation Committee for the purpose of taking concerted action in the advocacy of the Indian demands for Home Rule. Mrs. Besant sent a stirring message to the British labourers in England. She addressed them as 'Fellow Democrats' and declared: "We are demanding Home Rule as our birthright." She concluded with the following words: "Help us to become a free Commonwealth under the British Crown and we will bring our man-power to secure the World-peace. Our people have died in

your war for freedom. Will you consent that the children of our dead shall remain a subject race ?"

The activities of the Home Rule Leagues bore fruit. Eminent Americans and Englishmen wrote and spoke for self-government in India. A Committee of members of Parliament was formed in London for the purpose of pressing forward the claims of India to self-government. The Labour Party Conference at Nottingham, early in 1918, unanimously passed a resolution in favour of Home Rule for India.

7. General Review

The Home Rule Movement was the natural culmination of the Nationalist movement which had been gathering force since the Partition of Bengal and *Swadeshi* movement in 1905. But for the disintegration of the Extremist Party after 1907, due to causes and circumstances mentioned above, some such movement, would have probably made its appearance much earlier. Nevertheless, it seems fairly certain that the movement received a great impetus from two circumstances, namely, the outbreak of the World War in 1914, and the disgraceful treatment accorded to the Indians in South African and Crown Colonies which created great excitement in India about the same time.

The Home Rule Movement marked the beginning of a new phase in India's struggle for freedom. It placed before the country a concrete scheme of Self-Government, bereft of the verbiage with which the Congress, led by the Moderates, surrounded this political goal. It also emphasized the point that if the Congress really wanted to achieve this goal it must cease to be a club of arm-chair politicians taking to public work only to the extent to which their leisure permitted them ; instead, it should be guided by leaders who were prepared to place their whole time and energy at the service of their country. This new ideal of a political leader soon commended itself to the whole country and developed a new standard of public life.

The Home Rule Movement also emphasized the point that the entire national resources must be utilized to attain freedom and all national efforts should be geared to this one specific purpose. This perhaps explains Tilak's acceptance of the Congress-

League scheme of reforms whose baneful effects have been referred to above.[26] While moving the resolution endorsing this scheme of self-government at the Lakhnau Congress in 1916, Tilak said, with reference to the communal election and weightage conceded to the Muslims:

"It has been said by some that we have yielded too much to the Muslims. .....I say that we could not have yielded too much. I would not care if the rights of self-government are granted to the Muslim community only. .....I would not care if those rights are granted to any section of the Indian community. *Then the fight will be between them and other sections*[26a] of the community and not, as at present, a triangular fight..... We have to fight against a third party and therefore it is very important that we should stand united on this platform.....We have forged this weapon of unity and that is the most important event of the day."

Similar sentiment was expressed by Tilak while addressing a Conference, attended by about 1,000 Home Rulers, shortly after the Congress session at Lakhnau. He said:

"There is a feeling in certain quarters that excessive concessions were made to our Mussalman brothers, but *that was necessary to enlist their hearty support to the demand of self-government, whether that was right or wrong* from the point of view of strict justice. We cannot progress without their help and co-operation.....If there is a tripartite struggle, *two parties must join together to eliminate the third.* In the tug of war with the British, the Muslims must throw their weight on our side. To demand fearlessly that we shall rule ourselves in our home is our *immediate duty,* of one and all of us."

If we read between the lines and consider in particular the words we have put in *italics* in the above two extracts, it would seem that Tilak looked upon every other consideration as subordinate to the main idea of freeing the country from the British yoke. He was prepared to make every sacrifice for that supreme end, as the achievement of it was the only thing that mattered for the time being. It is, however, equally clear that Tilak did not look upon the concession made to the Mussalmans, *under duress,* as either just or a permanent solution of the communal problem. He visualized a prospective fight between those who

wrung undue concessions and the rest, but he preferred this dual fight to the triangular fight which India was then fighting. He stressed the need of Hindu-Muslim unity for eliminating the third party, and therefore regarded it as our *immediate duty* and the *most important event of the day*. His whole speech, particularly these two italicised phrases quoted from it, show how completely he was obsessed with the idea of Home Rule at any cost. He was prepared to mortgage the future of the nation in order to secure the price for immediate freedom, and then, after freedom is attained, to secure a just and equitable settlement between the communities as best we can under the circumstances. It is worthy of note that Gandhi, who succeeded Tilak as the political leader, not only inherited this policy but carried it to the furthest limit. There is, however, one difference between the two. Tilak did not inaugurate this policy which was shaped by the Congress during the period when he had nothing to do with it. He was faced with a *fait accompli* and the alternatives of either accepting it or throwing away the fruits of the laborious work of the Congress which promised immediate grant of self-government. But as we shall see later, Gandhi was not faced with a situation like this when he endorsed and developed this policy. But, even then, it is difficult to say how far Tilak was politically wise. In any case, Tilak's conduct in 1916 offers a striking contrast to his attitude towards the Muslims during the communal riots at Bombay and Poona in 1893 and 1894, caused by the opposition of the Muslims to the music before mosque during the Ganesh festival. Then "Tilak did not choose to lie low either before the Government or the Muslims when it came to defending the legitimate rights of Hindus as equal citizens of Her Majesty..... He had rightly assessed the general Muslim character and yet he did not seek to be unfair or unkind to them. But he refused to pay the price of meek surrender to buy their goodwill or friendship that was no friendship at all in his view. Surrendering to the bully never satisfied him—that was his maxim. To resist him, to show him his right place was the correct course of conduct in his opinion."[27] This is a very fair assessment of Tilak as he was in 1893-4. The great change that came over him in the course of the next 22 years is indicated by his speeches and action

at Lakhnau in 1916, and is probably to be accounted for by the fact that he was seized with a passionate zeal for freedom at any cost. They also prove that if Tilak had any communal feelings, as many people have alleged, he knew how to subordinate them to the interests of the motherland.

The Home Rule Movement was the fitting end of Tilak's noble political career, which shines brilliantly, particularly in contrast with the transformation that came over his colleague, Mrs. Besant, a little later. This great Movement shows him at his best—a sincere, fearless, unbending, patriot, who fought for his country with a religious zeal without caring for favour or frown, either of the people or of the Government. An intellectual aristocrat, he brought himself down to the level of the common people, whose grateful appreciation was symbolized by the title of *Lokamanya* (revered by the people) conferred upon him, nobody knows by whom. It was he who initiated that mass movement in the political field which worked such a miracle in the hands of Mahatma Gandhi.

Appendix

Later Career of Arabinda

The confinement of Arabinda Ghosh in a solitary cell in Alipur jail paved the way for a complete transformation of his life and character. He himself has given us some idea, in his famous speech at Uttarpara, how he had gradually progressed to spiritual life in which his political life was merged. This subject cannot be dealt with in this book in detail and readers are referred to the vast literature that has grown around it. So a short account must suffice.

Shortly after his release from the jail Arabinda started two weeklies.—the *Karmayogin* in English and the *Dharma* in Bengali. Hardly a year had passed when news was brought to him by Ram Chandra Majumdar, a member of the editorial staff of the *Karmayogin*, that the office of this Paper would be searched the next day and a warrant has been issued for his

arrest for writing the seditious article—"To My Countrymen"—published on 29 December, 1909, in the *Karmayogin.*

So far we are on sure grounds. But many stories and conjectures are afloat regarding the subsequent incidents. In particular, we are told that the news of his impending arrest was conveyed to him by Sister Nivedita, that he thereupon saw her and also the Mother (spouse of Sri Ramakrishna), etc., etc. The authentic account, recorded by Arabinda himself, runs thus: "While I was listening to animated comments from those around me on the approaching event (impending arrest), I suddenly received a command from above, in a voice well-known to me, in three words : 'Go to Chandernagore'. Ram Chandra Majumdar guided me to the *Ghat* and hailed a boat and I entered into it at once along with my relative Biren Ghosh and Moni (Suresh Chandra Chakravarti) who accompanied me to Chandernagore, not turning aside to Bagbazar or anywhere else (as the various stories would have us believe). We reached our destination while it was still dark: they returned in the morning to Calcutta."

On reaching Chandernagore Arabinda had sent Biren Ghosh to Charu Chandra Roy, a member of the revolutionary party mentioned above, seeking shelter at his house, but he refused. In the meantime Motilal Roy, mentioned above, apprised of the arrival of Arabinda, came to the *Ghat* and took him to his house. After remaining hidden at Chandernagore for about a month and a half (either at Motilal's house or some time in other places as well) Arabinda came to Calcutta in disguise and left for Pondicherry on 1 April, 1910, by S. S. Dupleix of the Messageries Maritimes Company along with Bijoy Nag. The British police came to know of Arabinda's flight only on 4 April, 1910.

Arabinda safely reached Pondicherry and spent the rest of his life there till his death in 1950. How he attained spiritual powers by meditation as a *yogin* and established an *Asrama* there, the name and fame of which has spread all over the world, is now a matter of history and does not concern us here. But, as will be shown in the next volume of this book, even in this stage of his life, until the attainment of independence by India, thoughts about her political emancipation were never absent

from his mind, and he kept himself in touch with the political developments in India.

References :

1. *Smritikatha* (in Bengali), by Suresh Chandra Chakravarty
2. *Smritir Pata* (Bengali), by Nalini Kanta Gupta.

FOOT NOTES.

1. See p. 203.
1a. See Appendix.
2. *Muslim League*, 71-2.
3. Ibid, 84.
4. Presidential Address at the Cocanada Congress, 1923.
5. *Sources of Indian Tradition*, p. 777.
6. *CHI*, VI. 481.
7. Ibid, 479.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid.
10. *War Memoirs of David Lloyd George*, II. 808.
11. *IAR*, 1919, part I, p. 142 ; part II, India Abroad, p. 6.
12. Mr. Fisher's statement in the House of Commons.
13. Mrs. Annie Besant, *The Future of Indian Politics*, p. 236.
14. The true feeling of the Indians towards the War was reflected in the speech of Tilak quoted in Ch. IX II, 9 and also in the comments of some journals whose editors did not either fear the wrath of the Government or seek its favour. Cf., e.g., the editorial notes in the *Modern Review* during the period of the War.
15. The above statements and many other pious platitudes of the same kind were frequently quoted in Indian journals with bitter comments that the British had no intention to apply them in the case of India.
16. Parvate, 329. The statements about Tilak (including quotations) are taken from this book, Ram Gopal-II, and Karmarkar.
16a. Mrs. Annie Besant, *India Bond or Free*, p. 162.
17. Raghuvamsi, V. P. S., *Indian Nationalist Movement and Thought*, p. 135.
18. Besant, *India Bond or Free*, p, 164.
18a. *Nation*, 237-8.

19. Chintamani, C. Y., *Indian Politics since the Mutiny*, p. 102.
19a. Ram Gopal, *Biography of Tilak*, p. 373.
20. Karmarkar, *Tilak*, p. 260.
21. Sitaramayya, *History of the Congress*, I. 131-3.
22. Ibid, 135.
23. The resolution is quoted in Ch. IX. II. 4.
24. Morley, John, *Recollections*, II. 240.
25. *IAR*, 1919, Part II, India in Parliament and Abroad, p. 45.
26. See p. 329.
26a. Italics mine.
27. Parvate, p. 110.

CHAPTER VIII

REVOLUTIONARY ACTIVITIES

I. Indian Revolutionaries Abroad

Reference has been made above to the growing idea of carrying on propaganda for the freedom of India in foreign countries and the establishment of important centres for this purpose in London and Paris (pp. 298 ff.). These showed how vigorous campaigns for freedom could be carried on outside India with far greater ease and security than in India, with the additional advantage of far greater success in the propaganda against 'British rule in India' and thereby creating public opinion and sympathy all over the world in favour of the just cause of India. Such an appeal to the bar of public opinion in Europe and America was regarded by the Indian revolutionaries, not without reason, as an important aspect of the struggle for freedom of great potential value. This was clearly indicated by the following observations made by Madam Cama in March 1910, in the *Bande Mataram*, edited by her from Paris: "We must recognise that the importation of revolutionary literature into India from foreign countries is the sheet anchor of the party..... and the centre of gravity of political work has shifted from Calcutta, Poona, Lahore to Paris, Geneva, Berlin, London and new York."[1] It is not surprising, therefore, that there was an organised attempt in this line in an ever-increasing degree almost from the very beginning of this century. Reference has already been made to such organisations in London and Paris.[2] But there were similar efforts in other foreign countries also. Shyamji Krishna Varma's Home Rule Society in London, mentioned above, had established contact with the Irish revolutionaries in Britain and, through them, with Mustafa Kamal, the young leader of Egypt, when he visited Britain in July, 1906, and the co-operation between Indian and Egyptian revolutionaries grew with years. They held a joint Conference at Brussels which was

formally opened by Farid Bey on 22 September, 1911. It is interesting to note that the Indian and Egyptian revolutionaries assured each other that the former would prevent Indian soldiers from taking any part in suppressing rebellion in Egypt and the latter would block the Suez Canal in case of a revolt in India.[3]

The Indian revolutionaries also realised the importance of Germany as a centre of activity because of the growing rivalry and enmity between that country and Britain which made her a common enemy to both India and Germany. This was clearly indicated by the fact that the *Madan's Talwar*, another paper issued in November, 1909, and edited by Cama, though officially published from Paris was actually issued from Berlin, and Cama wrote in the *Bande Mataram* in February, 1910, "The *Talwar* has made its appearance in Berlin, the capital of the country which is at present most hostile in spirit to England."[4]

Taking advantage of the strained relations between Britain and Japan caused by the latter's attitude towards Korea, attempts were made by the Indians to establish contact with Japan. Barkatullah and his associates created a favourable climate of opinion for India and established valuable contacts in Japan, as a result of which the Indian revolutionaries could obtain arms and ammunitions from Kobe and Yokohama. But Barkatullah soon got mixed up in a Pan-Islamic movement in Japan, helped by the Governments of Egypt and Turkey. With pecuniary help from these Governments he edited an English journal, the Islamic Fraternity, for carrying on intense anti-British propaganda. At the request of the British Government the Japanese Government suppressed that paper. The pro-British attitude of the Japanese Government made it impossible for Barkatullah to continue his anti- British agitation and he left for the United States in May, 1914.[5]

The Bengali revolutionary Bholanath Chatterji, on behalf of the Jugantar Party, visited Malaya in 1910 or 1911 and Thailand in 1913, and imbued the Indian settlers with revolutionary ideas. A Sikh Gurudwar at Bangkok became the chief centre of revolutionary activities in Thailand. By the time the First World War broke out "a fairly widespread revolutionary movement had been organised among the Indians in Thailand", and there was also an

"effective understanding between the Indians and the German officers and embassy in Thailand."[6]

The revolutionary movement also spread in China mainly through the Sikh Gurudwaras. The work was begun by Bhagwan Singh, the chief priest at Hongkong in 1910. He spread revolutionary ideas among the Indians, including the soldiers and the Police, and gradually the revolutionary urge spread to Hongkong (1912), Shanghai, Amoy and Swatow. The Indian leaders in China were in close touch with the local Germans and German Consulates, and Indian traders carried on secret trade in arms with their friends at home.[7]

Revolutionary movements were also spread among the Indians in Indonesia and the Phillipine.[8]

Indian revolutionaries also established contact with the Irish Americans who were bitterly anti-British, and some Indian students in New York, with their help, had been sending revolutionary literature to India as early as 1903. Since 1905 the *Gaelic American*, the popular Irish organ in New York, openly 'espoused the cause of Indian independence, inciting the Indians, specially the soldiers, to revolt.' A number of Indian organizations were established in the U.S.A. such as the 'Pan-Aryan Association' (1906-09) established by Samuel Lucas Joshi and Barkatullah, the 'Indo-American National Association', later called 'Society for the Advancement of India' by Myron Phelps and five other Americans (1907-09) with its branches at Chicago, and Detroit, and the 'Indo-American Club' (1909-10) by George Fitzerald Freeman.[9] Although these shortlived organizations did not produce any tangible result except training the Indians to prepare explosives and smuggling arms and bomb-manuals to India, they certainly awakened American interest in and sympathy for the Indian struggle to throw off the British yoke. All this proved very helpful when an effective organization was built up by the Indians in U.S.A.[10] This is the famous Ghadar Movement to which we may now turn.

II THE GHADAR MOVEMENT.

A. The Genesis.

Towards the end of the 19th and at the beginning of the 20th century there was a regular exodus of Panjab peasants to the out-

side world. Unable to earn the bare minimum of livelihood from the small plots of land they possessed, they migrated to Burma, Malaya, Singapore, Hongkong, Shanghai and other parts of China ; then to Australia, and finally to Canada and U.S.A. They were employed in large numbers by the owners of factory and farms in America, for they were cheaper than American labour. They were paid two to three dollars a day (six to nine rupees) and lived quite happily. The news of their prosperity attracted more and more men from the Panjab to America.

"Then came the economic crisis of 1907 accompanied by widespread unemployment and wage-cuts. The American workers, organised in their trade unions, fought back the capitalist onslaught, but not so the Indian labourers. Unorganised and actuated by the single motive of making money, they were often and easily utilised by the factory owners as black-legs. Their strike-breaking, as during the railway strike at Tacoma (Oregon), won the Indians the contempt and hostility of American workers. Widespread anti-Indian sentiment grew and took root. Gangsterism, the typical outcome of American labour conditions, followed in its wake. Indian lodgings in the towns of William, Ebert, St. John, Tacoma and elsewhere were attacked and looted, the labourers themselves forcibly pushed into cars and lorries and left stranded far away outside the town. The police was forewarned. knew what was happening and connived at it.

"The economic crisis passed and with it organised gangsterism. But anti-Indian agitation continued. The American outburst of the past few years had been directed as much against other European and Asiatic emigrants as against the Indians. But these others were free people, and their Governments could be relied upon to safeguard their interests. In one case of gangsterism, against the Japs in California, the Jap Government saw that for every single dollar of damage done to its citizens ten dollars were paid ; but the British Consuls and the British Ambassador refused to intervene on behalf of the Indians. For the first time it dawned upon the Indian immigrants that they were slaves.

"The Indians in America were mainly concentrated in California, Oregon and Washington. Men like "Potato King" Jwala Singh, his partners Wasakha Singh and Santokh Singh, Sohan Singh Bhakna, Kesar Singh, Kanshi Ram—these and many others

were making good money. But now, on looking round, they found that money could not buy respect for them.

"Everywhere they were insulted and despised. In hotels and trains, parks and theatres, they were discriminated against. Everywhere hung notice-boards: 'Hindus (i.e., Indians) and Dogs not allowed'. A white man refused to sit at the same table wtih Sohan Singh Bhakna ; another said to Kesar Singh, "You deserve not a job but a bullet" ; still others would ask them about their population, sharply adding with a sting. "Three hundred millions ! Men or sheep ?"[11]

Even friendly and sympathetic Americans consoled the Indians by saying "Americans hate slavery—and you are slaves." Thus dawned in the minds of the Indians in America, first the burning sense of shame that they were slaves, and next the value of liberty and democracy of which the most shining example loomed large before them,—the United States of America. This brought a political consciousness and yearning for liberty—and the feeling was strengthened by the events moving fast in Ireland, Egypt, China and Turkey. They also felt the impact of the nationalist movement in India.

The revolutionary ideas and activities which the educated Indian youths carried with them to Europe and America reached the sturdy peasants of the Panjab settled in large groups in U.S.A. Students read and explained to them the revolutionary papers like *Indian Sociologist* of Shyamji Krishna Varma and Madame Cama's *Bande Mataram* which had unrestricted entry into the U.S.A. Many well-to-do leaders of Indian settlers, some of whom have been named above, came forward to help Indian students, and a students' fund was established for service at home. By 1910 there were about thousand Indian workers between Vancouver and San Francisco and, two years later, vernacular newspapers had sprung up in British Columbia and California.

B. The Formation of the Ghadar Party.

The ground was thus prepared for the setting up of a political organization to give guidance and direction to the movement. The outcome of this was the formation of the Ghadar Party in 1913.

But the history of the foundation of the Party is somewhat obscure as various accounts, differing substantially from one another, have been given by those who were associated with it from the very beginning. The truth seems to be that several political organizations sprang up at different times and under different groups or individual leaders, and all these eventually coalesced into a single party. There is no doubt that "by 1906 Indians carried on nationalistic activities in U.S.A., and Indian students and labourers had established various headquarters in the country. During the *Swadeshi* movement Indian groups in America were publishing materials against the British Government in India. The *Free Hindustan*, published in 1908 by Tarak Nath Das and his group, was probably the first regular propaganda sheet in the U.S.A. It won American, particularly Irish-American, sympathy and support. Even before the World War I the State Department and its officials, at the request of the British, wanted to suppress this activity. But they were thwarted by the local laws and popular American support for India."[12]

According to the information supplied by Pandurang Khanakhoje, he and a few other Indian students in California, such as Khagendra Chandra Das, Tarak Nath Das and Adhar Chandra Laskar, established "Indian Independence League" in 1907. There were two branches of the League with 400 (499 according to N. N. Bhattacharya) members. Their main activity was propaganda work among the Sikh settlers in America, and they also sent revolutionary leaflets to India for distribution. These were received by Lala Pindidas of Rawalpindi, for which he was imprisoned for seven years. Revolutionary propaganda was carried on in California, Oregon, Washington and British Columbia. In 1910 Portland became the centre of their activities, with Kanshiram Joshi as their leader, and the party grew powerful in 1911-12. In 1913 Hardayal joined the party and infused new life in it. He changed the name of the organization to 'Ghadar'.[13]

The above account goes somewhat against the general impression that it was Hardayal who founded the Ghadar Party. Shri Darisi Chenchayya, who has published an account of the Ghadar Party, gives prominence to a Bengali leader, Jitendra Nath Lahiri, and adds many interesting details. He says that

"there were not more than ten persons who had knowledge of the early history of Ghadar movement." "Of these ten, nine are no longer in our midst. I am the only survivor". He himself got his training in revolutionary activities from Jitendra Nath Lahiri to whom he pays high compliments.

Randhir Singh, who cites "Baba Sohan Singh Bhakna, oldest of the Ghadar heroes yet living", as his authority, gives the following account:

"Sohan Singh Bhakna, who was at that time working in a timber factory at Astoria, took the initiative. A meeting was held there on 13th March, 1913, to which came 120 Indians including forty representatives from towns and factories of Oregon and Washington. Another, a bigger and more representative gathering, was held on 1st November, 1913, at San Francisco, to confirm the decision of the last meeting. 15,000 dollars were collected at these two meetings and the 'Hindi Association of America' was founded. It was decided to bring out a weekly paper, *"Ghadar"*, named in commemoration of the Mutiny of 1857, in Urdu, Marathi and Gurumukhi. This gave the Association its now hallowed name—the Ghadar Party.

"The resolutions founding the Ghadar Party laid down its aim as the overthrow of imperialist Raj in India and the building up in its place of a national republic based on freedom and equality. This aim could be achieved only by an armed national revolution. Every member of the Ghadar Party was declared to be in honour and duty bound to participate in the fight against slavery carried on anywhere in the world.

"In the first elections Sohan Singh Bhakna and Hardayal were elected as President and Secretary, respectively. The Central Office of the Party which came to be known as 'Yugantar Ashram' remained at 436, Hill Street, San Francisco, till 1918 when the Party built its own building at 5 Wood Street."[14]

Whatever we might think of these different accounts, there seems to be little doubt that since 1913 Hardayal was the guiding spirit of the movement which, under his dynamic personality, took final shape in that year in the formal inauguration of the Ghadar Party.

Hardayal was born in Delhi in 1884, and educated in St. Stephen's College, until he took the B. A. degree of the Punjab

University and was awarded a scholarship tenable in the Government College, Lahore. In 1904 he stood first among the successful candidates for the M.A. degree in English literature, and on the recommendation of the Punjab University was given a State Scholarship of £200 a year by the Government of India. He entered St. John's College, Oxford, in 1905, and began to read for the Honours School of Modern History, but in 1907, being imbued with revolutionary ideas, resigned his Government scholarship, and his name was removed from the College books. He associated himself with Shyamji Krishna Varma who, in his journal, the *Indian Sociologist*, stated that Hardayal had resigned his scholarship, "as he holds that no Indian who really loves his country ought to compromise his principles and barter his rectitude of conduct for any favour whatever at the hands of the alien oppressive rulers of India."

"After a visit to India, where he spread the doctrine of active hostility to the British Government, Hardayal in 1908 rejoined Shyamji Krishna Varma in Paris, but finding him unwilling to adopt violent methods in the furtherance of political ends, he determined to transfer the centre of his activities to America."[15]

Hardayal, then 28 years old, arrived in U.S.A. in 1911 and was appointed a lecturer in Indian Philosophy at Stanford University. He was, however, dismissed from the University. The reason for this is not definitely known. In a letter dated 22 July, 1939, Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, former President of Stanford University, said that Hardayal 'was dismissed for overplaying his relationship to the University.' This is a bit enigmatic, but evidently means that he was taking advantage of his status and position in the Universiy to further his revolutionary campaign in U.S.A.

After his dismissal Hardayal spent his whole time and energy in his revolutionary propaganda among the Indian settlers. He made a tour and addressed various public meetings which drew large crowds of Indians, and he was acknowledged as leader by his countrymen on the Pacific Coast. Accompanied by a few students, he called the first general meeting in the Yolo Park near Davis, California, in May, 1913. The next meeting took place in Sacramento. Then the Indians began to hold their gatherings frequently at various places, and wherever Hardayal

went, he attracted large crowds. His unpretentious bearing, his clear logic and brilliant oratory imbued his audience with respect and admiration for his leadership.

Finally, in June, 1913, a meeting was called at Astoria, that brought to a climax all the previous activities and propaganda campaigns among the Hindus. In response to an appeal for funds, an enthusiastic young man, named Kanshi Ram, donated £1,000, and others present followed his example. In a short time a considerable amount of money was collected and the Pacific Coast Hindusthani Association was formed with Hardayal as General Secretary, Sohan Singh Bhakna as President, and Munshi Ram as Secretary and Treasurer.[16] The purpose of this organization, called Ghadar, was to establish in San Francisco headquarters for a propaganda campaign. In anticipation of a political crisis in Europe, Hardayal was preparing to play a part in the impending struggle against Britain.

The organization began to function from a place at 436 Hill Street, San Francisco, named the "Yugantar Ashram," after the well-known revolutionary journal published in Calcutta. A Central Committee was formed to formulate plans of action. It was composed of several members elected by various State committees functioning at such places as Astoria, Marysville, Sacramento, Stockton, Fresno, Bakersfield, Los Angeles, and Imperial Valley. Each of these committees sent two elected representatives to constitute the central body which served for two years. Its regular meetings were held every three months, but in case of emergency, the President was authorized to call a special session to consider important problems. The most important function of this body was to educate its supporters in Indian politics, and to collect funds.

C. The Activities.

The main activities of the Ghadar Party, besides the regular campaign of lectures, were the publication of the *Ghadar* and various books and pamphlets.

The weekly journal, the *Ghadar,* sometimes called the *Hindustan Ghadar,* was first published on November 1, 1913, in San Francisco. The first issue of this paper boldly declared :

"Today there begins in foreign lands.....a war against the British Raj.....What is our name ? Mutiny. What is our work? Mutiny. Where will mutiny break out ? In India. The time will soon come when rifles and blood will take the place of pens and ink." This clearly foreshadowed the line of policy to be pursued by the paper.

Each issue of the paper had on its front page a set feature which was called "*Angrez Raj ka Kachcha Chittha*" (a transparent account of the British rule). It contained a long list of the crimes perpetrated by the British in India. This indictment of British rule was very popular with all Indians living abroad, for it gave the Indian version of British rule in India and was meant to be a set-off against the virulent propaganda carried on against India by the British Government. The *Ghadar* sought to arouse the national self-respect of the Indians by perpetually emphasizing the point, that they were not respected in the world because they were not free. The *Ghadar* also kept India's struggle for freedom in the forefront of world opinion by publishing the biographies of the great Indian patricts who fought for the freedom of the motherland. At the same time it inspired the Indians by publishing life-sketches of the fighters for freedom in other countries.

Almost every issue of the *Ghadar* contained poems urging upon young India to take up arms, rise in insurrection, kill the British, etc. On the other hand, it published informative articles on Indian culture—showing the great height attained by the Indians in the past in various branches of art, science and letters, in order to give lie direct to the British propaganda, which had been hitherto going unchecked, that the Indians occupied a very low rung in the ladder of civilization.

Among the specific measures suggested by the *Ghadar* may be mentioned the following :—

(a) The seduction of Indian troops; (b) the murder of loyal subjects and officials; (c) hoisting the revolutionary flag ; (d) the breaking of jails; (e) the looting of treasuries, *thanas*, etc.; (f) the propagation of seditious literature; (g) union with the foreign enemies of the British; (h) the commission of dacoities; (i) the procuring of arms; (j) the manufacture of bombs; (k) the formation of secret societies; (l) the destruction of railways and tele-

graphs; and (m) the recruitment of young men for revolutionary work.

The *Ghadar* became very popular, particularly among the Indians living abroad. Its circulation rose by leaps and bounds and the paper appeared in different languages,—Gurumukhi, Urdu, Hindi and English. The facts and ideas published in the *Ghadar* were taken by other papers and thus the *Ghadar* became a centre of world-wide revolutionary propaganda, on behalf of India, to raise the country in the estimation of Europeans and Indians. In the next section is published the assessment of the Ghadar Party's propaganda by an American scholar who made a special study and research on Ghadar Movement for writing a dissertation on the subject for the Doctor's Degree in an American University.

While the Ghadar Party was steadily growing in power and prestige, the Indian settlers in America were faced with a grave crisis by the new Immigration policy of the U.S.A. for total exclusion of the Orientals. Its object, at least a sure consequence, was to make it impossible for Indians to live in U.S.A. The State of California passed a law to the effect that no alien could own any land or even take it on lease. The British Government, far from taking up the cause of the Indians, told the U.S.A. authorities that the Indians were to be treated as Oriental. Once more the Indians in America formed a distinct and degraded class of citizens and felt the abject nature of their position, due to their political status at home.

Hardayal denounced in strong language the new discriminating policy of U.S.A. and the indignation of the Sikhs, who formed the majority of the Indians in U.S.A., knew no bounds. Just at this moment Hardayal lost the sympathy and support of the Americans by an act of great indiscretion—he championed the cause of the Syndicalist party and made public speeches from its platform. The American Government, whose mind was already poisoned by the British Government against Hardayal, now regarded him as a dangerous character. On 25 March, 1914, on a complaint of the British Council, Hardayal was served with a warrant of arrest, preliminary to deportation as an undesirable alien. Hardayal was released on bail, and it was believed at the time that this was due to the influence of W. J. Bryan, then Secre-

tary of State in U.S.A., who was sympathetic to India's struggle for freedom. Anyway Hardayal took advantage of the bail to leave U.S.A. The bail money provided by his friends was forfeited, but Hardayal safely reached Geneva in Switzerland and edited a paper there called the *Bande Mataram*. One of his faithful adherents, Ram Chandra, was left by Hardayal in charge of the affairs of the Ghadar Party. An editorial board with Ram Chandra as Chairman was set up to carry on the publicity work including the *Ghadar* newspaper. Ram Chandra also invited Bhagwan Singh and Muhammad Barkatulla, who were then in Japan, to come to his aid. They joined him towards the end of May, 1914, and they all proceeded on a lecturing campaign. Bhagwan Singh was elected President and Barkatulla Vice-President of the Ghadar Party.

Barkatulla was a native of Bhopal and a strong advocate of anti-British Pan-Islamism. In 1909 he became Professor in Tokyo University, and started a paper called the *Islamic Fraternity*. In 1911, he visited Cairo, Constantinople and St. Petersburgh, and also contacted Shyamji Krishna Varma. After his return to Japan the tone of his paper became so anti-British that the Japanese Government suppressed it in 1912. Two years later, in 1914, he was dismissed by the Tokyo University and then came to San Francisco to join the Ghadar Party.

D. NATURE OF PROPAGANDA BY THE GHADAR PARTY[17].

The literature of Ghadar propaganda comprises pamphlets, handbills, newspapers, letters to the Press, and a monthly periodical. Generally speaking, the letters to the press were of the highest level, the magazine articles a cut lower, and the other material often verged on the crude or sensational. Photographs and drawings were used sparingly. One full-page cartoon entitled "The Path of the Hangman" depicted a black-hooded muscular figure with the Union Jack on his chest bearing a hangman's axe in his left hand and a knout in his right, with which he flogged a semi-nude young girl tied to a cross. The caption read: "John Bull, the Beast-of-Prey-That-Walks-Like-a-Man, pursuing his path of Blood, Tears, and Ruin across the world

amidst the cries of agony and despair rising day and night from throttled India, Ireland, Egypt, Persia, Mesopotamia and the latest victims of his greed, falsehood and ferocity' (March, 1921).

One of the main themes of the Ghadar propagandist was the appeal to nationalist groups within the empire. The Ghadar Party on July 21, 1919, presented to Eammon De Valera, President of the Irish Republic, an engraved sword and his national flag. Gammons, Secretary of the Pacific Coast Branch of the 'Friends of Freedom' for India, read an address on the occasion. He pointed out that only a few weeks earlier some Irish Americans had protested against the deportation of several Indians. The next year the Ghadar Party sent condolences on the death of martyr Mayor MacSwiney of Cork. It predicted that such cold-blooded murder as his would be answered in a way which would for ever quench the blood-thirst of the British and hoist the flag of freedom throughout the empire. In 1921 three revolting sex-crimes committed by the British soldiers against Irish women were cited.

It was alleged that the British deliberately created communal dissension in India to strengthen their own position. An army of Government provacateurs and huge sums spent for creating riots were mentioned by a Muslim writer, F. Husain Khan. Another favourite tactics was to identify the cause of India with the American tradition of democracy and freedom. Ram Chandra said: "We aim at nothing less than the establishment in India of a republic, a government of the people, by the people, for the people in India." In another letter he said : "Indians desired to come to the United States to escape the oppressive poverty under British rule, hoping to better their status in the land of freedom and opportunity." It was British policy to prevent Indians from being contaminated with ideas of political freedom.

Ram Chandra appealed to the idealism of President Wilson. The President was reminded that the United States became a free nation by an act of rebellion against the British. He compared the benevolent rule of the USA in the Philippines to British rule in India which allowed millions to die of starvation, Hindus to be sold like slaves in the British colonies, and women to be dishonoured every day.....

Two years later the Ghadar Society reported how in Philadelphia (where America declared her independence) a stirring welcome was given to a parade of Indian revolutionaries. "Ten thousand American citizens joined the parade to protest against English barbarities in India and Ireland, as also to register Philadelphia's open recognition of the sister republics of Ireland and India. Piladelphia, the home of Benjamin Franklin, knows full well what it is for a nation to struggle for the recognition of foreign power".

The appeal to labour was couched in terms of "drain theory" England was siphoning off the wealth of India by economic exploitation—tax policy and customs duties hindered industrial development—Lancashire was protected by an excise tax on domestic cloth. Peasants were forced to pay 60 to 70 per cent. of their produce as tax. Average annual income of an Indian was nine dollars according to Curzon and five dollars according to Digby. Men and women of labour were urged to prevent the ruthless oppression of labour in other countries. Self-rule for India, Egypt and Ireland would enable workers to control the conditions of their own lives. These appeals had their effect. "At the twenty-first annual convention of the Cailfornian State Federaion of Labor, a resolution was passed which speaks of the valiant efforts of the Indians to free their country from the tyranny of the British". "The sooner the masses thoroughly grasp the fact that the interests of the proletariat are identical everywhere in the world, and realize the latent power of the people, the speedier the shackles of slavery and bondage will be shattered".

The account of Amritsar massacre, based on the Congress report, formed the subject of one pamphlet. It was perhaps the most popular single subject of Ghadar literature, inspiring drawings, endless comments, and even verses. The Ghadar party published an indictment of Police methods by a Britisher, replete with sensational charges. "A woman named Gulab Bano was convicted of poisoning her husband on her own confession and was sentenced to death. She appealed to the Chief Court at Lahore to set aside her sentence on the ground that her confession had been extorted—that the pollice had hung her to the roof and introduced spice pepper into her.....with a

baton. A Civil Surgeon examined her and corroborated the story and the decision was reversed by the Appellate Court. The Government upon review came to the conclusion that the woman had inflicted the torture upon herself and upheld the original decision. The Police who were implicated were acquitted. Meanwhile the woman died in a lock-up of a fever".

Prohibitionist sentiment of U. S. A. was also exploited. "At a time when the people in the U. S. A. are engaged in making their country dry, the British Government in India is busily engaged in making India wet". Even suffragist feeling was roused by citing the instances of Indian women like Sarojini Naidu who were doing public work.

The purpose of the propaganda was to enlist American sympathy. "Its effect on the American public is almost impossible to gauge, but literature of the type examined probably won a certain amount of sympathy for Indian nationalism, especially among the working classes".

"The attempt to excite active disaffection was apparently concentrated in the vernacular publications ; the propaganda in English was largely aimed at capturing American public opinion. The latter end was approached by identifying the Ghadar cause with anti-imperialist sentiment in general and Irish republican feeling in particular; with the American tradition of freedom and democracy ; with the interests of organised labour ; with humanitarian sympathies ; and even with prohibitionist and suffragist sentiment. The illustrations used either pictured Ghadar martyrs or victims of atrocities calculated to evoke hatred of British rule".

The strength of the party seemed to have dwindled toward the end of the twenties. There is some reason to suspect that its energies may have been diverted into the larger stream of international Communism.

III. OTHER REVOLUTIONARY ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE INDIA DURING THE FIRST WORLD WAR.

A. Germany

1. General Plan

The outbreak of War between England and Germany[17a] on August 4, 1914, was hailed with delight by the Indian revolutio-

naries living abroad. They had been anticipating such an event for a long time and eagerly looked for the day when the British would be involved in a war with Germany. For they instinctively felt, like the Irish, that England's necessity was India's opportunity. The general plan to be followed, if such a contingency occurs, was crystal clear to the revolutionaries. They would turn to Germany for active help and use, as base, U. S. A., a neutral country, where they had already a well-knit revolutionary organization.

Whether consciously inspired by such a policy or not, the Indian revolutionaries, mostly students, had long been engaged in preparing the ground in Germany. There is clear evidence that as early as 1911, if not before, a large number of Indian students was in Germany and some of them had been trying to secure German help for a rising against the British in India. A few of them even managed to contact high German officials for the purpose, but no positive result was obtained by way of securing arms and money for revolt in India.

In spite of initial failures the Indian students in Germany never gave up all hope. In view of the growing animosity between England and Germany, particularly since the Agadir incident in 1911 [17b] the Germans were expected to be friendly towards the Indian revolutionaries. Even some prominent German writers publicly expressed this feeling before the outbreak of the Frst Great War. Reference may be made in this connection to the famous book, "*Germany and the Next War*", by Von Bernardi, published in October, 1911. In this book, the author expressed the hope that the Hindu population of Bengal, with a revolutionary and nationalist tendency, might unite with the element of Islamic unrest, and thus create troubles for Britain when she was engaged in a war with Germany. On March 6, 1914, the *Berliner Tageblatt* published an article on "England's Indian Trouble" which drew a vivid picture of the situation which the British were then contending with in Bengal. It stated that the English were faced with conspiracies and secret societies everywhere, and that these were spreading and were aided from outside. It also stated, what afterwards proved to be true, that there was an organized conspiracy to supply revolutionary India with arms and explosives. As a matter of fact,

the San Francisco trials revealed that prior even to 1911 Hardayal had planned a campaign with German help.

2. Indian Independence Committee in Berlin

As soon as the War borke out, the Indian revolutionaries, both in Germany and U. S. A., renewed their efforts to enlist the sympathy and support of the Germans. Their success was beyond their expectation. For now the Germans were equally, if not more, anxious to utilize the revolutionary activities of the Indians against the British. They had two definite objects in view. First, to stir up armed rebellion in India in order that the British would be forced to send back the Indian army from the Western front to India, thereby considerably weakening their position in the vital centre of the war. Secondly, to excite anti-British spirit among the Indian soldiers in the Western front by playing upon the national sentiments of the Hindu sepoys and the religious pro-Turkish feeling of the Muslim soldiers, so that they might not fight against Germany with whole heart, but surrender afer making a feint of military operations.

The support of the German Government was thus assured to Indian revolutionaries, though it was due, not so much to the love for the Indians as the hostility against the British. In any case, the promised support was given in full measure. An organization was set up in Berlin, and contact was established with the Indian revolutionaries in U. S, A, through German Embassy in that country. The German Government opened the purse strings wide and spared no pains to supply India with arms and money.

Unfortunately it is not easy to give a clear and authentic history of the organization that was set up in Berlin and the activities carried on by it. Different accounts have been given by different persons who all claim to have participated in these activities, and there is sometimes wide divergence between them, particularly where personalities are concerned. As a matter of fact, the differences in the various versions are mainly concerned with the parts supposed to be played by different Indian revolutionaries.

A fairly comprehensive account is given by Bhupendra Nath

Datta, himself a revolutionary. A summary of this account is given below:

As soon as the war broke out in 1914, a few revolutionaries in U. S. A. saw the German Ambassador there and proposed to send a Volunteer Force of Indian soldiers with an Ambulance Corps, in order to show their enmity towards the British and friendship and sympathy for their enemy, the Germans. They agreed to supply soldiers, doctors and an Ambulance Corps, and requested the German Government to do the rest, Those who made this proposal included Bhupendra Datta and Khanchand Varma (Secretary of the Lahore Congress).

The German Ambassador in U. S. A. accepted the proposal and communicated it to Berlin. He undertook to bear the entire expenditure and to make arrangements for the transport. After this the proposers wrote to Ram Chandra, the leader of the Ghadar party at California, requesting him to supply volunteer soldiers from among the Sikhs; but he did not agree, for he thought that it will serve no useful purpose and the soldiers should be rather sent to India. The proposers held the view that as the British were sure to employ Indian soldiers in this war, and thereby proclaim to the world the loyalty of the Indians towards them, it would be diplomatic to send an Indian Force to Germany to counter this view; but unfortunately Ram Chandra was not convinced by this argument and so the whole matter had to be dropped.

Some time after this an Indian revolutionary named Birendra Nath Chattopadhyaya (brother of Sarojini Naidu), who was in Germany, published a small pamphlet entitled *Japan, the Enemy of Asia.* As noted above, the German Government kept themselves informed about the revolutionary movement in India, and it appeared that they also possessed some information about the whereabouts of some of the revolutionaries abroad. A few Indian revolutionaries in Germany therefore planned to approach the German Government for helping them on the following basis.

(a) That they should accept he money from the German Government as a national loan to be repaid when India will attain independence.

(b) That the Germans will supply arms, and their repre-

sentatives in all the countries will help the Indian revolutionary movement.

(c) That the Turks will help the movement and the Sultan will declare *Jihad* against the Allies in order to induce the Indian Muslims to fight against the British.

A young Bengali student, named Abinash Chandra Bhattacharya, through his German friends, arranged an interview between Birendra and Baron Von Bertheim of the German Foreign Office. The latter had a short talk with Birendra and sent him with a courier to Baron Oppenheim. This Baron gave Briendra 500 Marks (equivalent to about Rs. 400) and the whole plan was matured shortly afterwards in a prolonged conversation with the Baron at Berlin on September 3, 1914. Then a Committee was formally constituted with the name 'Deutscher Verein der Freunde Indien' (The German Union of Friendly India).[17c]

Herr Albercht Ballin, General Manager of the Hamburgh American Steamer Co., a great friend of the Kaiser, was elected the President, Baron Oppenheim and Sukhthankar, Vice-Presidents, and Dhiren Sarkar, the Secretary. After Sukhthankar left for India, Birendra was made Vice-President, and after Dhiren was sent to America, Dr. Mueller was appointed the Secretary. There were 17 other Indian members in the Committee.

As regards the work done by the Committee, the following may be regarded as of special importance :

(1) Training in the preparations of explosives in a camp at Spandau near Berlin (the chemists among the members of the Committee learnt to prepare bombs, hand-grenades, time-bombs, land-mine etc).

(2) Members were taken to the arsenal and shown the use of the most modern types of weapons.

(3) Some members were taken to the Prisoners' Camp in order to carry on- propaganda among the imprisoned soldiers.

(4) A consulation was held with the Naval Officers for concerting measures to convey weapons to the Indian coast.

Some members were sent to the U.S.A., and they sent Jitendra Nath Lahiri, Lala Hardayal, Bhupendra Nath Datta,

Taraknath Das and others to Berlin, and Kedareswar Guha, Birendra Nath Mukherjee and others to India.

Arrangements were also made with the Ghadar Party to carry on the revolutionary work jointly.

By the middle of 1915, the old Committee was reconstructed. There was no foreign member in it and it was called 'Indian Independence Committee'. At first Mr. Mansur Ahmad was elected President, but this post was abolished and the work was carried on in a democratic manner on the principle of collective responsibility.

The Committee invited all the revolutionaries in India and abroad to formulate a common plan of action. Funds were supplied to a number of persons in India and messages were sent to them to secure fire-arms.

The main work of the Berlin Committee was to organize the revolutionaries, both in India and abroad, with a common plan of action. They sent men and money to India with instructions to inform the leaders of both Nationalist and Revolutionary organizations that help would be forthcoming from Germany by way of supply of weapons, and that they should organize themselves accordingly and prepare plans beforehand.

Indian revolutionaries also went to various eastern countries such as Japan, China, Philippines, Siam, Java, etc., for helping the importation of arms from Germany. It was decided that the Germans in Siam, along with the Indians there will attack Burma through Moulmein, and the Germans in China will be divided into two groups, one joining the party in Siam and the other attacking Burma through Bhamo with the exiled King of Burma as their head.

It was also planned that three ships, full of arms, would be sent to India. One with 500 German Officers and 100 soldiers will proceed to the Andamans, release the political prisoners, and then go to Calcutta. The second will go to some other place in Bengal, and the third will go to the western coast. As soon as Burma would be attacked, there will be revolutionary outbreak in the Panjab and Bengal, and an attempt will be made to invade India through Afghanistan and Baluchistan. This and similar plans were made by the Indian revolutionaries and the

Germans at different times, but could not be carried into effect, for reasons that will be stated later.

In May, 1915, the Berlin Committee sent a German, named Vincent Kraft, to Batavia with instructions to invade the Andamans, release the political prisoners and remove them to a neutral country, and help the importation of arms. After reaching Batavia he reported that the plan was feasible and that he had met some Indian revolutionaries (persons sent by Jatindra Nath Mukherji); but a few months later reports reached Berlin that Kraft was captured by the English at Singapore, and so nothing came out of this plan.

A few Indian revolutionaries saw the German Consul at Bangkok, but some of them were captured and made confessions to the British. A few other later turned approvers. The Consul was not very pleased and made an adverse report against them.

A few Bengali revolutionaries fled to China, as Shanghai was a great centre for the supply of arms. Phani Chakrabarti *alias* Pain was arrested at Shanghai and practically nothing was done.

In July, 1915, the Berlin Committee sent Dr. Daus Dekkar, a leader of the Nationalist Party in Java, for work in that region and to help the Indians in transporting arms, but he was arrested in China by the English. Later he turned approver and divulged the whole plan.

A revolutionary Committee was set up in Iran with headquarters in Berlin. The object was to arrange for an outbreak in Persia against both the Russians and the English. A few Iranis and Indians were sent to Persia, and they arrived in Turkey in February-March, 1915. One batch went to Baghdad via Iran, and another went to Damascus along the Suez Canal. An attempt was made to spread revolutionary ideas among the Indian sepoys under the British, but it did not prove successful.

At the beginning of 1915, a few Indian revolutionaries—Barkatullah, Kersamp and Tarak Nath Das—went to Istanbul, and Enver Pasha received their deputation. The Turkish Government helped the Indians to formulate a plan of enlisting the Indian war prisoners into a Revolutionary Army, but this plan could not be worked with success. According to Bhupendra Nath Datta, this was due to the communal attitude of the Muslim prisoners. He further says that there was a distinct

difference in the treatment of the Hindu and Muslim soldiers who were held as prisoners by the Turkish Government.

As regards the Revolutionary Army, the German Government was definitely against it, but was in favour of sending it to Iran. This was, however, not approved by the Berlin Committee who wanted to send it to India.

An International Socialist Conference was held in Stockholm in 1917. As revolutionaries from different countries assembled there, the Berlin Committee took advantage of it to carry on propaganda. The Berlin Committee sent a telegram to Trotsky at Brest Litovsk, requesting him to make a proposal for the self-determination of India. Trotsky actually proposed at this conference that both the Allies as well as the Axis Powers should grant the right of self-determination to the countries subject to them. The Committee also sent a telegram to Philip Snowden to raise the question of Indian independence in the Socialist Conference held at London. In this way the Committee made propaganda also in the neutral countries, stressing the need of granting independence to India without which there will be no peace in the world. After 1917 the Committee devoted its energy mainly to this propaganda work so that India's cause might be considered at the time of the Peace Treaty, for they gave up all hope of a rebellion in India.

The account given above on the authority of Bhupendra Nath Datta[18] does not refer to Hardayal as playing any important role. On the other hand, Datta makes many deprecatory remarks against him. He is charged with attempts to create dissensions within the Berlin Committee in order that he himself might pose as the only representative of Indian revolution before the German Government. He was expelled from the Committee for his intrigues, but received constant help from the German Government for carrying on his individual activities in Holland, Vienna and Sweden during 1915-18. Yet, in his book, *Four Years in Germany*, Hardayal wrote that the German Government virtually kept him a prisoner, and did not allow him to freely move out of Germany. After mentioning all this Bhupendra Nath Datta categorically asserts that Hardayal's book is a tissue of lies.

On the other hand, Hardayal is credited by many with playing the chief part in the Indo-German conspiracy. Thus an American author, who made a special study of German plots in U.S.A., observes :

'In Germany Hardayal was taken in hand by Von Wesendonck, Secretary in charge of the Indian section of the Foreign Office ; and together they organized the "Indian Independence Committee". At their rallying call numerous Indian nationalists, chiefly students in various Indian Universities, flocked to Berlin. Regular meetings were held, attended by German officials who knew India well ; a special fund amounting to several million Marks was provided by the Imperial Government ; and a campaign was outlined to promote sedition in British India. Emissaries were sent there through Turkey and Afghanistan, and the organization in the United States was brought under the direction of the Central Committee in Berlin. Finally, Germany's diplomatic representatives throughout the world were instructed by the German Foreign Office to render material aid and assistance".[19]

This is quite in keeping with the early activities of Hardayal in California, as described above. But Bhupendra Nath Datta's denunciation finds some support in the confession of Hardayal in 1919 by which he repudiated the part he had hitherto played. He wrote :

"I now believe that the consolidation of the British Empire in the East is necessary in the best interest of the people of India.....Imperialism is always an evil, but British and French imperialism in its worst forms is a thousand times preferable to German or Japanese imperialism."[20]

Since 1919 this great rebel leader lived an obscure life and died in 1939 as a pacifist, whlie on lecture tour in the U.S.A.

Like Hardayal, Champakaraman Pillai is also credited with playing an important role. According to Bhupendra Nath Datta's account, Champakaraman Pillai was a member of the Berlin Committee, mentioned above. He belonged to a respectable family of Travancore. His revolutionary speeches drew the attention of the Government and he had to leave India in 1908, while he was still in his teens. After having studied in Italy and Switzerland he went to Germany to complete his edu-

cation. He made Germany his home for more than twenty years, and during this period carried on revolutionary propaganda on behalf of India, both among Indians and in various countries in Europe.

Before the ourbreak of the First World War he set up at Zurich an Asscciation, called the International Pro-Indian Committee, with himself as President, and started a journal called *Fro-India*. After the outbreak of the Great War, he left Zurich to carry on his anti-British propaganda in Germany. So far we are on sure grounds. But a very important role is ascribed to him by some. It is said that with the permission of the German Foreign Office, he rallied round him such men as Birendra Chattopadhyaya, Abdul Hafiz, Dr. Prabhakar, Bhupendra Nath Datta, and Mohammed Barkatulla. This marked the inception of the Indian Independence Committee (Hardayal was added in January, 1915), which, after the conclusion of the Indo-German alliance, became officially attached to the Foreign Office in Berlin. The Committee was to direct all Indian affairs, subject, of course, to the approval of the German General Staff, and under its jurisdiction numerous sub-committees were established in various parts of the world, including New York, Chicago, Amsterdam, Zurich, Geneva, Constantinople, Tokyo, Malia, Hongkong, Peking, Bangkok, and Batavia. At the same time, through Batavia and Bangkok, direct connections were made with secret revolutionary societies in India.

How far such claims corresponded with actual facts, it is difficult to say. But there is no doubt that Champakaraman Pillai actively helped the Germans in order to secure advantages for India. During the war he organized the Indian National Volunteer Corps with the help of the German Government. It was composed of Indians living in Europe, in the first instance, but Pillai hoped to be able to induce the Indian prisoners of war to join it. For this purpose he issued a stirring appeal to the Hindu and Muslim prisoners of war. He chose Mesopotamia as the centre for his Corps to wage war against tre English. It is said by one authority that the Indian prisoners in large numbers joined this Corps. But we have no authentic record of its strength and activities.

Champakaraman possessed an Engineering Degree and

joined the German Navy as an officer in the Cruiser *Emden* which shelled several places in India. It is said that he helped the German naval officers with his knowledge of South Indian coast and even surreptitiously came to the mainland to secure information.

Whether Champakaraman carried on these activities as a member of the India Committee, or by a personal arrangement with the German Government, cannot be clearly ascertained. But it seems he was a great favourite of German high officials including the Kaiser. The British Government were also fully aware of his activities, and they feared him so much that they set the great spy Mata Hari against him and announced a reward of hundred thousand pounds for his capture. Champakaraman's activities in Afghanistan in 1915 and his subsequent career will be noted in due course.

There is an interesting reference to the work of the Indian Independence Committee in Berlin in the Judgment of the 3rd Lahore Conspiracy Case. It is said that "the Indian Revolutionary Society, which aimed at establishing a Republic in India, held constant meetngs attended by Turks, Egyptians, German officials and, most noteworthy of all, German ex-prisoners and ex-missionaries, who in their time had received the hospitality of the British Government in India. Hardayal and Chattopadhyaya were in daily communtication with the German Foreign Office. To carry out the revolution in India, there was an Oriental Bureau for translating and disseminating inflammatory literature to the Indian prisoners of war in Germany. Inflammatory letters, drafted by the German Government and addressed to the Indian Princes, were translated and printed, and meetings were held in which the common objects of Germany and India were dilated upon; these meetings being sometimes presided over by highly placed German officials".

B. Indo-German Activity in U.S.A.[21]

We possess fairly authentic account of the revolutionary activities of the Indians in U.S.A. This is due to tthe fact that confidential wireless messages between German Government and

German ambassador in U.S.A. were intercepted by Britain and communicated to U.S.A. authorities, who also seized secret documents from German Embassy immediately after U.S.A. had declared war against Germany. These documemnts and other evidences, mainly secured by the Brittish spies engaged in U.S.A to watch the Indian revolutionaries, were produced in tthe State trial at California to which reference will be made later. The following outline of events, drawn up on the basis of all these, may be regarded as fairly accurate. A number of relevant statements and other information elicited during the trial, or otherwise available, has been added in an Appendix (II) to this section in order to supplement the outline story by important and interesting details without making it too complicated for a general reader.

As mentioned above, Ram Chandra assumed the leadership of the revolutionary Ghadar Party after the departure of Hardayal. The Berlin Committee at first entrusted Ram Chandra with the main task of sending men and arms to India to raise there an armed rebellion against the British. Ram Chandra evidently succeeded in this task to a certain extent. "In the early months of the War the rebels established a secret way to India. Men were sent to Shanghai where Tehl Singh made necessary arrangement for the trip to Swatow. There a German merchant provided transportation to Siam. From Siam the plotters were smuggled across the Indian border. That a large number passed in this way is indicated by the fact that Tehl Singh spent thirty thousand dollars helping the revolutionists who passed htrough Sanghai. Ram Chandra also repaired the breach between the Hindus and Muslims and influenced Nawab Khan, the Muslim leader, to join an expedition which was to leave immediately for India under Jawala Singh. The group, numbering about sixty, sailed from San Francisco, on August 29, 1914, on the steamship *Korea*. Ram Chandra, who remained behind, promised that arms would be available when the conspirators reached India. When the *S. S. Korea* docked at Canton, Nawab Khan received from the German Consul there a guarantee of safety from attack by German warships which were in the vicinity. Other Indians joined, and on October 8, 1914, the augmented group of about one hundred and fifty left Canton on a Japanese vessel for India.

Landing at Calcutta, Singh and his few followers were immediately captured by the British".

This disaster led to the appointment by Zimmerman of Heramba Lal Gupta as the leader of the plot in the U.S.A.[22] Gupta undertook the twofold task of enlisting men and obtaining arms. The first was easier to accomplish than the second. Gupta opened negotiatons for the purchase from the Chinese Government of Sun Yat-Sen of a million rifles which were already in South China, but the idea was given up when it was learnt that most of these rifles were flintlocks or muzzle-loaders. Gupta then went to Japan to see if military supplies coulld be obtained there. "Within forty-eight hours he learned that the Japanese planned to turn him over to the British. He spent the next few months hiding from the police, and his attempts to procure arms proved futile."

Even before Gupta left for Japan the German diplomatic corps stationed in the U.S.A. was setting in motion plans to place modern arms on the shore of India. Captain Franz Von Papen, military attache of the German Embassy, asked Hans Tauscher of the Krupp Agency of New York to buy arms and ammunition for about ten thousand men and to send them as secretly as possible to San Diego, California. Tauscher purchased and in January, 1915, shipped cartloads of freight containing 8,000 rifles and 4,000,000 cartridges to San Diego. On the Pacific Coast E. H. von Schack, German Vice-Consul at San Francisco, arranged with J. Clyde Hizar, City Attorney for Coronado, a little town across the bay from San Diego, for placing the cargo on board the schooner *Annie Larsen* which had been chartered for the purpose. Fourteen thousand dollars were given to Hizar by the German Consulate and he posed as a representative of the Carranza faction in the Mexican Civil War then raging. Word was passed along the water front that the *Annie Larsen* was to sail for Mexico. On the evening of March 8, 1915, all lights were extinguished on board the *Annie Larsen* and on the tug which was to tow it to sea, and the two vesseles slipped quietly out of the bay.

In Los Angeles an American Attorney, named Ray Howard, was asked by a German friend, Fred Jebsen, to form a dummy corporation to buy the tanker *Maverick*, which was for sale. The plan which Jebsen then drew up called for the *Annie Larsen*

to leave San Diego, loaded with arms, while the *Maverick* was to clear from San Pedro empty. The two ships were to meet at the little Mexican island of Socorro, about three hundred miles south of the tip of Lower California. There the arms were to be transferred to one of the empty oil tanks of the *Maverick* and covered with oil. The ammunition was to be stowed in a separate tank and kept dry. The two ships were then to separate, the one to go to India with the arms, and the ohter to return to American waters. Should the tanker be in danger of capture it was to be sunk.

It was given out at San Pedro that the *Maverick* was going to releive the congestion in the East Indian Coconut industry. When it cleared from San Pedro on April 23, 1915, it carried five Indians recruited by Ram Chandra and an ample supply of revolutionary literature.

One week later *Maverick* arrived at Socorro Island, only to learn from a note from Page, the super-Cargo of *Annie Larsen*, that after a wait for a month that vessel was forced to go to Mexico for supply of water. Page promised to return as quickly as possible and requested that the *Maverick* await his return. While waiting, the *Maverick* was searched by both British and American warships. After waiting for twenty-nine days the *Maverick* sailed north and anchored off the Coronado islands and telephoned San Francisco Consulate. He was told to take the tanker to Hilo, Hawaii, and after reaching there was ordered to lonely Johnston Island in the mid-Pacific, where another vain wait for the *Annie Larsen* ensued. Following instructions, the Captain took the tanker to Anjer, Batavia, where it was seized by the Dutch authorities. Starr-Hunt, the super-Cargo (a young American), and four Indians escaped, but the ship on which they were fleeing was stopped off the coast of Sumatra by a British cruiser, and the five plotters were taken to Singapore, where Starr-Hunt confessed his part in the intrigue.

The *Annie Larsen* arrived at Socorro Island, but after a month water supply being exhausted, sailed to Acapulco, and left it after paying a bribe of seventy dollars. For twenty-two days the Captain tried to return to Socorro Island, but the attempt had to be given up as the provisions again ran low. Adverse winds, apparently, made it impossible for the sailing ship to

reach the island. Several weeks afterwards stormy weather caused it to seek shelter in the port of Hoquiam, Washington, thousands of miles to the north. There, on June 29, 1915, customs officials seized the craft when the nature of its cargo was discovered.

It is difficult to understand why the *Maverick* did not sail until forty-six days after the *Annie Larsen*. The German Consulate blamed Page for the failure.

Another enterprise of Heramba Lal Gupta (p. 389) met with similar failure. He planned to send the American Schooner *Harry S*, with a cargo of 5,000 revolvers from Manilla to Bengal. It had on board a German-American named George Paul Boehm and a number of Indian revolutionaries. The object of Gupta was to arrange military training of Indians in Burma by Boehm, who was a military man. It had been arranged that five hundred revolvers were to be left at Bangkok for use in the prospective revolt in the Burma-Sian border and the rest would be taken to Chittagong. But the customs authorities got scent of it and seized the cargo. A detailed account of this is given on p. 397 on the authority of the *New York Times*.[23]

In February, 1916, Heramba Lal Gupta was replaced by Chandra K. Chakravarty by the Berlin Committee.[23a] Within a few weeks the files of Wolf von Igel, a German national living in New York, were seized by the U.S.A. agents. These files contained many of the plans for the Indian conspiracy.

Chakravarty organized a Pan-Asiatic League to cloak the movements of the plotters, had sent one agent to Japan to enlist support there, and another to appeal to the Indians living in the West Indies. Ample funds were provided by Germany. Chakravarty received fifty thousand dollars in May and in August was asking for an additional 15,000[24]. In San Francisco Ram Chandra was receiving monthly a thousand dollars from the German Consulate. But little progress was made for securing arms. In one report Chakravarty admitted that in a period of six months no more than two hundred pistols had been smuggled across the Pacific.

Attempts to enlist the active support of Japan continued. It is said that the great poet Rabindra Nath interviewed, on behalf of the conspiracy, Count Terauchi, the Japanese Premier,

and Count Okuma, a former premier, as well as a number of minor officials. But this is certainly a story concocted by Chandra K. Chakravarty as Rabindranath himself denied the whole thing[25]. Taraknath Das also urged the Japanese to form an alliance with Germany.[25] An agreement was proposed with China which provided for German military support for China if China would help the Indian revoluionaries by forwarding arms to them across the border. The Chinese were to receive one-tenth of any military supplies thus handled. But Sun Yat-Sen opposed a German alliance. So Indians obtained sympathy from influential elements in China and Japan, but nothing else.[26]

Other troubles dogged Chakravarty. The Indians were split into various groups. Only with great difficulty could partisan jealousies be kept under control. Many of the Sikhs living on the Pacific Coast refused to co-operate, and it was widely rumoured that the British were bribing some of them to break up the Ghadar Party. The leadership of Ram Chandra was criticised, and complaints against his arbitrary control reached Berlin. Chakravarty went to San Francisco and brought about a temporary truce, but, within a few months, Ram Chandra created a new strife by expelling from the party three of his associates, whom be accused of misappropriating funds. The split in the Pacific Coast ranks was complete.

Shortly after midnight on the morning of March 6, 1917, Chakravarty was arrested in New York for violating the Neutrality laws of the U.S.A. With his arrest a great quantity of evidence came into the hands of the Federal authorities, and the plot withered in the glare of the publicity. Chakravarty readily revealed the identity of his associates. On April 7, 1917, the day after the U.S.A. declared war, Ram Chandra and sixteen other Indians were arrested in San Francisco. More men were gradually arrested in Chicago and other places, and the Federal authorities decided to concentrate the prosecution in San Francisco.

On July 7, 1917, 105 men were indicted as conspirators. Preston, the District Attorney, opened his charge with a short account of the conspiracy which may be summed up as follows:—

'For more than a year prior to the outbreak of the European

war, certain Hindus in San Francisco and German agents were preparing openly for war with England. At the outbreak of the War Hindu leaders, members of the German Consulate here, and attachés of the German Government began to form plots to carry out a conspiracy to incite revolution in India for the twofold purpose of attempting to free India and aid the Germans in their military operation. The Hindus on the Pacific Coast were canvassed and those willing to take part in the revolt were registered. Emissaries were sent to Germany and India. Committee was formed in Berlin. Arms and ammunitions were purchased with German money. Men were recruited and sent to India ; military expeditions were organized from America and Siam ; arms and ammunitions were smuggled through China and Japan. The whole conspiracy was a well-defined effort to create a revolution in India.'

The trial opened on November 20, 1917. All the defendants pleaded not guilty. Chakravarty was allowed to act as his own defense attorney, but was so truthful that the rest of the defendants loudly denounced him. There were deep-seated feelings of distrust and charges were made on the witness stand that Ram Chandra was a grafter and had diverted Association money to his own use. On the last day of the trial Ram Singh, a defendant, sent four bullets into the body of Ram Chandra, and was shot dead by a marshal. The judgment was delivered on April 23, 1918.

Except an American all oher defendants were found guilty. Of the original 105 defendants, 29 were convicted, three had changed their pleas to guilty, 1 was found not guilty, 2 were dead, 1 had been adjudged insane, and the remainder had either fled the country or become Government witnesses. Chandra K. Chakravarty was sentenced to 30 days' imprisonment and a fine of five thousand dollars. Thirteen other Hindus, several of them highly educated, were sentenced to imprisonment from twenty-two months to sixty days.

The mystery surrounding the death of Ram Chandra has not been cleared up. The following comment in the *New York Times* (24 April, 1918) is probably the nearest approximation to truth :-

"Animosity among the defendants was such that all were

searched for weapons daily when entering court. Ram Singh had obtained the weapon in the course of a brief recess in the morning session when he had wandered out in the corridor for a moment. Belief that Ram Chandra had diverted to his own use proceeds from property which Ram Singh had turned over for use in the proposed revolution is said by Federal officials to have prompted the shooting". Ram Chandra got all the news he wanted from India through copies of the Koran marked peculiarly. Native censors would not touch these books, he said, and apparently nobody else understood the system.

Shortly after the main trial another trial for conspiracy was held, and the judgement was delivered on April 30, 1918 : Two years' imprisonment and fine of 10,000 dollars each were imposed upon Frank Bopp, former German Consul-General, and Von Schack, former Vice-Consul, at U. S. A., following conviction on charges of conspiracy to foment revolution against British rule in India. Baron Wilhelm Von Brincken, former military attaché at the Consulate General, pleaded guilty to the conspiracy charges and was sentenced to two years' imprisonment. Several other Germans were also sentenced to imprisonment.

As mentioned above, one of the accused was adjudged insane. This was Jodh Singh, about whose activities some details will be found on p. 397 (6). Jodh Singh refused to be an approver and is said to have been so much tortured by the American police that he became mad and was put in a lunatic asylum. No authentic confirmation of this is, however, available.

Chandra K. Chakravarty, who played a prominent role in organising the Indians revolutionary activities outside India spent the last days of his life quietly in Calcutta and died on 15 May, 1971, at the age of 94. (Born 11 April, 1877).

Before concluding this section reference may be made to some important documents in support of what has been stated above.

I. Intercepted German Diplomatic Correspondence produced by the U. S. A. Government at the San Francisco trial of the members of the Ghadar Party on February 27, 1918.

The Documents submitted included several letters written

from Rye, N. Y., at one time the summer headquarters of the German Embassy at U. S. A.

1. The following was addressed to Z. N. G. Olifiers at Amsterdam from Rye by Chandra K. Chakravarty (?):—

"Sir Rabindranath Tagore has come at our suggestion. He said he saw Count Okuma, former Japanese premier, and Count Terauchi, present premier. Terauchi was favourable. Sir Rabindranath also consulted a number of minor Japanese officials." (The letter bore no signature, but Giles T. Brown says it was from Chakravarty. Op. cit. p. 306; cf footnote 7).

2. The following was from Count Bernstorfl, writing from Rye, on June 16, 1916, to Olifiers :-

"The first batch to reach its destination has reported its success. Many are afraid that if arms are not available soon, there will be premature uprisings in India. Fifty thousand copies of "*Why the Indians are revolting against British Rule*" are available. The work in Japan is going along unusually well."

3. An unsigned letter to R. Sachse. Rotterdam, dated January 21, 1916 :-

"Dr. Chakravarty will return to the U. S. A. to form a new American Committee which will include Ram Chandra and himself. He has agreed to send an agent to the W. Indies where there are 100,000 Indians and also to British Guiana, Java and Sumatra, and to conduct secret propaganda in America. It is also proposed to send a mission to Japan.

4. On 27 December, 1914, the following coded cable, number 449, was sent by Zimmerman to Von Bernstorff :

"A confidential agent of the Berlin Committee, Heramba Lal Gupta, is shortly leaving for America in order to organize the importation of arms and the conveyance of Indians, now resident in the United States, to India. He is provided with definite instructions. You should place at his disposal the sum which he requires for this purpose in America, at Shanghai and Batavia, viz., 150,000 Marks. Sanction should be requested by telegraph for any additional expenditure under this head. Sarkar must postpone further action until the confidential agent joins him, but he should not for the time being be told the name of the latter."

This was followed up on 31 December, 1914, by a further coded cable from Zimmerman to Washington :

"In continuation of number 449. You should in conjunction with Gupta—but without attracting attention— take steps to have such Indians as are suitable for this purpose instructed in the use of explosives by some reliable person."[27]

II. Cutting from the *New York Times*, the principal newspaper in U. S. A.

1. Chandra Chakravarty and Se Kunna, a German subject, arrested yesterday. They received 60,000 dollars from Von Igel, a member of the German Embassy staff. Chakravarty admits visiting Berlin a few months ago, conferred with high officials and with Jodh Singh, head of the anti-British organization known as the Indian National Society. The complaint against them is that these, along with others, plotted in New York to start insurrections and rebellions in India. They sent from New York a Chinaman named Chen with instructions to import arms and ammunitions (7 March, 1917).

2. Chandra Chakravarty arrived in U. S. about February 25, 1910. He was 32 years old and had connections with Paris and Petrograd (8 and 9 March, 1917).

3. Chandra Chakravarty confessed that the idea of Indian rebellion was put into his head or at least encouraged at the German Foreign Office (12 March, 1917).

4. Heramba Gupta, 30 years old, arrested. He received large amounts from German officials in U. S. and went to Japan in 1915, but failed to get assistance. Gupta said his interest in Germany began before the War. He spent some time in Berlin prior to it. A great sum was set apart by Germany to stir up rebellion in India and this was entrusted to Papen. Chakravarty received about 60,000 dollars and Gupta between forty to fifty thousand. His mission in Japan was to send guns and ammunitions from there to India (11 and 12 March, 1917).

5. T. J. Tunney (of New York Police Department) testified that Heramba Lal Gupta made the following confession : "Captain Von Papen, military attaché of the German embassy of U. S., paid him between fifteen or sixteen thousand dollars in

six or seven instalments to be used in making a trip to the Orient. He said that he went to China and Japan and purchased fire-arms and ammunition for use in the revolution in India. Von Papen said he would buy additional fire-arms and ammunitions in U. S. and ship them to the Orient by way of the South Seas. Gupta returned to U. S., in June, 1916, after having been followed by detectives all over China and Japan. On one occasion he was given protection in Japan by a high official. The headquarters of the conspiracy was Berlin." (11 and 12 March, 1917).

6. Jodh Singh, now in Berlin, lived before the War in Chicago where he was known as Prince Sada, and mixed with German agents, one of whom named Bohn was recently captured in Calcutta. This followed the capture in the Bay of Bengal of a schooner on board of which the British found a score of Indian plotters all believed to have been identified with conspiracies hatched in the U. S. At least a dozen of these plotters are said to have been executed for their part in the plan. The expedition of which these men were a part was fitted out at Manila and the ship on which they set out for India was called *Harry S.*

Chandra Chakravarty and Se Kunna were members of the Cosmopolitan Club of the Columbia University, well-known to all. They purchased two houses at New York. Released on bail of 25,00 dollars each (7 March, 1917).

7. Arrest yesterday of Miss Agnes Smedley, an American girl, also known as Brundin, and Sailendra Nath Ghosh, prominent in the activities of "Indian Nationalist Party" with headquarters in Tagore Castle in Calcutta. Made plots in India. Leon Trotzky was appealed to for aid in stirring up trouble in India and was asked to use his influence against the U. S. arresting Hindu plotters in U. S. The two prisoners sought to carry on their work in Brazil, Panama and other south and central American countries. Ghosh is already under indictment in California along with others for conspiracy in that State to bring about revolution in India (19 March, 1918).

8. Sailendra Nath Ghosh, Pulin Bihari Bose, Tarak Nath Das, Jadugopal Mukherji, Bhai Bhagwan, and Miss Agnes Smedley of San Francisco were indicted in New York yesterd

for attempting to stir up rebellion against British rule in India and for representing them as diplomats (2 April, 1918).

9. Ghosh, Bose, Das, and Sedley, together with three Americans and one Russian were indicted also at San Francisco on June 11 on the charge of defrauding President Wilson through misrepresentation that they were an accredited mission from the Nationalist Party of India (12 June, 1918).

10. Letter written by Hardayal (under the assumed name of "Israel Asronson") in October, 1915, to Berkman. Hardayal urged Berkman to send "some earnest and sincere comrades" to help the Indian revolutionary party. The second letter asked Berkman to send "real fighters, I. W. W. S. and anarchists", and said : "Our Indian party would make all necessary arrangements." Hardayal suggested that some of these 'earnest comrades' for use in the Hindu revolutionary movement might be found in New York or Paterson. He also asked Berkman for the names and addresses of prominent "anarchist comrades" in Spain, Denmark, France, Sweden, Norway, Switzerland, Italy Germany, Austria, and other European countries, and asked for letters of introduction to them from Emma and Berkman (25 February, 1918).

11. Attorney-General's statement : "It was testified to in the San Francisco trial that Srinivas R. Wagel, a Hindu prominent in plans for the revolution, had asked Count Bernstorfl for twenty million dollars to finance the proposed revolution against British rule in India. T. J. Tunney, witness, said that he was told of this request by Dr. Chandra K. Chakravarty." (But Wagel denied it in a letter to the *New York Times*, dated 26 February, 1918).

12. Statement of Sukupar (mar-?) Chatterji in the Sessions Court at Chicago, 18 October, 1917 : "George Paul Boehm said to me in Manila that he had planned to kill Dr. Cook and his crew who were to make an expedition in the vicinity of Himalaya mountains. He (Boehm) and his friends then would travel over India as Cook and his party and foment a revolt among the natives."

Chatterji said he came to U. S. A. in 1912 to study journalism but was induced to take part in the alleged plot by Gupta. He told of meetings he heid in San Francisco in 1915 at which

revolutionary plans were discussed and of going to Manila with the other conspirators. He was imprisoned for six months in solitary confinement in India before he confessed and was brought here (19 October, 1917).

13. Lajpat Rai wrote : "I am a Hindu nationalist working for the attainment of self-government for India, but I do not believe it would be worth our while to achieve that end by foreign military aid" (9 March, 1917).

14. Sedition amongst the Oraons of Chotanagpur preached by the German Missionaries during the War (11 March, 1917).

15. Von Igel Papers disclose the names of several hundred persons who were implicated in the plot hatched in New York to instigate rebellion in India. The persons were in all parts of U. S. A., Hawaii, Philippines, Japan, China, and India (13 March, 1917).

16. Dhirendra Kumar Sarkar, Hindu Chemist, arrested at Paterson (N. Y.) on 14 August on the charge of training men in bomb explosions and conspiracy against Britain by setting on foot a military expedition while in the employ of the German Government (21 August, 1917).

17. Trial at Mandalay of four men for seditious conspiracy in Burma. An Indian witness swore he went to Berlin in the spring of 1915 to meet Hardayal. He attended meetings of the Indian Revolutionary Society whose object was to expel with German aid all English from India and all Muslim countries Indians, Persians, Egyptians, Turks, and many Germans attended the meetings. In a meeting at the house of Baron Oppenheim (formerly attached to the German agency at Egypt) he (Baron) said that Germany would help India and other countries to free themselves. Money for the Ghadar Movement was supplied by the German Government. The witness went to U. S., saw the German Consul at New York and also Gupta who asked him to join in the Siam expedition. In New York, the witness met a German Fine Art Engraver named Makde who said he was going to India with 20,000 dollars for the Ghadarites in Bengal. The witness told of meeting various German conspirators in Chicago and said the German Consul there gave him eight hundred dollars and also a code message to take to the German Consul in Shanghai (20 May, 1917).

18. Baron Kurt von Reiswitz, former German Consul in Chicago, and thirteen others, including nine Hindus, were indicted on June 2 for fomenting a revolution in India. Plots were centred in New York, Chicago and San Francisco. Von Reiswitz gave twenty thousand dollars for the instigation of the revolt. George Paul Boehm was employed in March, 1915, in drilling the Hindus in preparation for the revolt in India. Wehde left with Boehm and Sterneck for India in May, 1915, to engage in the rebellion. Some of the Hindus named are under arrest in various parts of the U. S. while others are said to be in India (3 June, 1917)

19. The Attorney-General's statement: "It has also been disclosed at this trial that there was a plot to effect a secret treaty between Germany and China whereby the former would protect the latter from all aggressions for five years if Chinese forces were sent into India to aid a proposed revolution there. The details of this plot were outlined in code messages between Chakravarty and a committee of German officials and others in Berlin. Copies of the messages in the original and decoded form were introduced at the trial" (19 December, 1917).

20. Unsigned letters addressed to the secret German agent at Amsterdam whose duty was to transmit them to Berlin :

i. Wuting Fang has now been made Foreign Minister. He has always been sympathetic with our course, but the influence of Sun Yat Sen still persists in opposing us in that direction (28 March, 1918).

ii. I doubt whether my health will permit a trip to the coast. I am sending Rogers to Japan. We have organized the Pan-Asiatic League, but it will not be necessary to buy the two Japanese dailies as they are agreeable to our interests and they have decided to attack the Anglo-Japanese Treaty (28 March, 1918).

21. Vials of deadly poison found amongst the effects of a Hindu revolutionist in New Work. These were to be administered to men in New Work suspected of betraying the plots of German agents and Indian revolutionists to stir up outbreaks in British India. The poison was brought by an Indian student from Mexico (28 March, 1918).

22. Schroeder, former Secretary of the German Consulate

at Honolulu, was fined 1,000 dollars today. He pleaded guilty to a charge of conspiracy to foment revolution against British rule in India (19 February, 1918).

C. Revolutionary Activities in Britain and France.

The arrest of Savarkar and the failure of the plan to rescue him at Marseilles, mentioned above (pp. 304-6), practically brought to an end the activities of the Indian revolutionaries in Britain. Bepin Chandra Pal made a futile attempt to resuscitate political activity and on 8 November, 1910, founded a Society which was first called 'Hind Bardaree' and then 'Hindusthan Society'. In 1911 he started a monthly journal, *The Indian Student*, with financial assistance from the Gaekwar of Baroda. Only two issues were published and the Society was dissolved in September, 1911.

The state of things in Paris was no better. The leading revolutionries in Britain had gone to France to rescue Savarkar, and when that failed (p. 306) they did not return to Britain, evidently because it was not considered safe to live there and carrying on revolutionary propaganda was out of the question. The entente between Britain and France, highlighted by the visit of King-Emperor George V to Paris on 21 April, 1914 served as a danger signal to the Indian revolutionaries in France. Virendranath Chattopadhyaya went to Germany and Krishma-varma proceeded to Geneva. That their apprehensions were not unfounded were soon proved. Madam Cama and Sardar Singh Rana, who did not leave France, soon came to grief. The *Bande Mataram* edited by Cama was suppressed by the French authorities in June, 1914. It appears from the British official records that shortly after the outbreak of the War, when the Indian troops arrived at France, both Rana and Cama tried to instigate them with revolutionary ideas, and Cama even proceeded to Marseilless for the purpose. The British Government took strong exceptions to their activities in France and requested the French Government to deport both of them to England. The French Government did not agree to this proposal and after some discussions met the British Government half-way by interning both of them in French territory. Rana, with his

family, was deported to Martinique and Cama was interned at Vichy. The British Government took the further precaution of removing the soldiers of the Lahor and Meerut Divisions from France. Thus the curtain fell on the activities of the Indian revolutionaries in France.[27a]

D. Revolutionary Activities in Indo-China.

Even after the failure of the scheme to stir up rebellion in India with the help of the arms supplied by Germany, Indian revolutionaries acted in concert with Germany. They were liberally helped with money. There are evidences to show that the German Consul of Chicago paid money to Abdul Hafiz, and about half a dozen men were sent by Von Burken from San Francisco who were "assisted to the tune of many thousands of dollars by Von Papen." The well-known revolutionary. Barkatulla, was engaged in a campaign to win over Indian prisoners of war in German camp, thus continuing the work of Champakaraman Pillai, which anticipated the achievement of Subhas Chandra Bose during the second World War.

But the main activity seems to have been concentrated in Burma, Siam and Malay Peninsula. It is not easy to draw a clear and connected outline of the work in this region, which began quite early, though we get occasional glimpses of important incidents happening here and there. Two of these, viz. the mutiny at Singapore and the revolutionary activities at Bangkok may be described in some details.

1. *Mutiny at Singapore*

The normal garrison of Singapore was a British and an Indian battalion. The British battalion had been sent home and the Indian battalion, the Fifth Light Infantry, was composed entirely of Muslims, largely from Hindusthan. There were some 300 German sailors and civilians interned in a camp near Tanglin Barracks. On the 15th of February (1915), just on the eve of departure for Hongkong, the Fifth Light Infantry at Alexandra Barracks mutinied. The mutineers broke up into three parts, one to overpower the men guarding the German internment camp and release the prisoners, another to attack the

house of its commanding officer, Col. Martin, and a third to prevent any assistance reaching from Singapore. Further, several small parties were formed, apparently to murder stray Europeans. The first party attacked the camp and there was a terrible massacre. A number of officers, N. C. O., and men of the regulars and volunteers and several others were killed inoluding some German prisoners. Having detroyed the camp, guard, the mutineers rushed in and tried to enlist the support and sympathy of the German prisoners. But these refused to have anything to do with them and also refused the arms and ammunition which were offered. So, the disappointed mutineers left.

The second party who atttacked quarters of Col. Martin was also not very successful, as the defenders kept them at bay for the whole night.

But the third party of the mutineers who had marched off on the Singapore road killed quite a large number of British military and civilians. Detached groups also killed quite a large number of Europeans. The mutiny continued on the 16th and 17th. In the meantime, a French and a Japanese cruiser in the vicinity were summoned by wireless, andt help was received from the Sultan of Johore. The sloop *Cadmus*, which was in the port, also sent a landing party. Volunteers were also recruited. With the help of all these, the muttiny was suppressed on the 18th. Many of the mutineers were captured, but some three hundred of them dispersed in the jungles. The native population remained singularly quiet and no sympathy was displayed with the mutineers by any section of the people. Eighty of the rebellious battalion went to the colonel's house to say they were loyal and ready to help and they reported themselves to the police station.

As a result of this mutiny, the casualties on the side of the British were 8 officers, 1 lady, 9 soldiers and 16 civilians murdered, with a few more wounded. As regards the mutineers, two of the leaders were hanged and 38 were shot, all in the public. The Fifth Light Infantry ceased to exist.[28]

A somewhat different account is given by Lt. General G. N. Molesworth in his book *Curfew on Olympus—The Last Days of British Rule in India.* (*Asia Bulletin,* December, 8, 1965). This may be summed up as follows:

On February 15th, the 5th Light Infantry, a Muslim class battalion, stationed at Singapore, mutinied, rioted and surrounded a Club in which a number of British Officers and civilians were sitting. Seven British Officers and 12 European civilians were killed, 2 officers subsequently died of wounds, 12 Indian Officers, N.C.O.s and men, who perhaps remained loyal. were killed and some 10 other persons seriously injured. The mutineers were driven out of Singapore into Johore State by Garrison Artillery-men, Singapore Volunteers and landing parties of Marines and Sailors from the Fleet. They were pursued by Johore State Forces and practically annihilated. Not unnaturally the news, released after sometime, created a profound impression in India,

2. *Revolutionary Activities in Siam*

Reference has been made above to the arrangements made for despatch of arms to Siam and training of Indians on the frontier for the invasion of Burma. At first Heramba Lal Gupta, who is described in the Sedition Committee's Report as "Indian agent for Germany in America", was in charge of these operations. Later, Heramba Lal Gupta was succeeded by Dr. Chakravarty who received the following credentials signed by Zimmerman (Foreign Secretary of Germany):

"To the German Embassy, Wash:

In future all Indian affairs are to be exclusively handled by the Committee to be formed by Dr. Chakravarty. Birendra Sarker and Heramba Lal Gupta, which latter person has meantime been expelled from Japan, thus ceased to be independent representatives of the Indian Independence Committee existing here." This was dated, Berlin, 4th February, 1916.

The British official version of the revolutionary activities in Siam and the neighbouring regions may be summed up as follows:—

"Gupta returned to San Francisco from Berlin to organize the Siam expedition by wihch Depots were to be established on the Siamese frontiers of Burma where Indian revolutionaries could be trained by German officers, equipped with arms, and launched against Burma. There Ramchand sent many of the Ghadar Party, while the Sikh, Bhagwan Singh, was despatched

to Japan, China, and Manila to collect recruits from among the Indians serving there. But most of these were arrested at Bangkok in August, 1915, shortly after their arrival there. Some made their way to Burma, but were arrested in connection with the German conspiracy case which was engineered from Chicago. Four of the leaders were convicted at a trial there. Some of the Bangkok party escaped to China. The later developments of this conspiracy were revealed to the New York Police by a Bengali who had been summoned to Berlin by Hardayal and who had been sent to Japan to induce that nation to adopt an anti-British attitude."[29]

E. Indo German Mission in Afghanistan

As has been shown above, the Indian revolutionaries in Europe and America made elaborate attempts to enlist the sympathy and support of various nations in Europe, America and the far East in India's efforts to regain her freedom. Casual reference has also been made to similar attempts made in the Middle and Near East. We have got a number of memoirs of individual revolutionaries giving some account of the negotiations or conspiracies in which they were engaged. Some of them tried to influence the Indian soldiers stationed at Suez. Failing to reach them in the ordinary way, it was even contemplated that some of them should swim across the narrow channel at night to the Sepoys' camp, but this was considered too risky and ultimately given up Attempts were also made to form a regiment out of the Indian soldiers imprisoned in Turkey, but this scheme also failed, and it is alleged that the failure was due to communal spirit between the Hindu and Muslim soldiers, and the partiality shown to the latter by the Turks. How far this allegation is true it is difficult to say. Attempts were also made to combine the Muslim States of Arabia against the British, and Obeidullah carried on negotiations for this purpose with various Arab States. He had a very ambitious plan, but it was more a visionary than a practical one. It, of course, came to nothing, but it shows that even at this period a section of Indian Muslims rose against the English more as a result of Pan-Islamic idea than any desire to free India from the British yoke.

Of all the attempts made in the Middle East the most important was the Indo-German mission sent to Kabul, headed by Raja Mahendra Pratap. We have fortunately an account by the Raja himself, and as this mission has attained some historical importance, a short account of the life and activities of Raja Mahendra Pratap, as narrated by himself,[30] is given below :

The Raja was born in the family of the Chief of Hathras. This family lost its principality in the year 1818, but as the head of the family helped the British during the Sepoy Mutiny, he got the title of Raja and some villages.

Mahendra Pratap was inclined to patriotic activities from his boyhood. He attended the session of Indain National Congress in 1906, and took the vow to use only *Swadeshi* goods in accordance with its resolution. As soon as the first World War broke out, he went to Europe. He met Hardayal at Geneva and proceeded with him to Germany. There he was given a right royal reception and had an interview with the Kaiser. With the help of the German high officials he succeeded in getting the German Government interested in India's struggle for freedom. The German Chancellor wrote letters to 26 Indian princes and a mission was sent to Afghanistan. On the eve of the departure of this mission the Chancellor, Bethmann Hollweg, gave him a letter with his signature promising him German support in his work for India.

The Indo-German mission which went to Afghanistan consisted of the Raja, Maulana Barkatullah, mentioned above, and Dr. Von Henting of the German Diplomatic Service holding the rank of Legations Secretary. A number of Afghan-Afridi soldiers accompanied the mission. The mission, on its way through Turkey, visited Istambul where the Sultan gave an audience to the Raja and gave him a letter for the Amir of Afghanistan. The Turkish high officials showed great sympathy for the object of the Mission, namely, conquering India from the British. Barkatullah procured a *Futwa* from Sheikh-ul-Islam asking the Muslims of India to act in unison with the Hindus. At Ispahan, in Persia, another imssion under Niedermayer joined this mission to travel together. After suffering a great deal of troubles from Iranian brigands, in the course of which a part of the luggage, including most of the documents, and some of the

men were lost, the mission reached Afghanistan. Here the Kabul Government gave the mission a right royal reception and the members were treated as guests of the State. On 2 October, 1915, the mission reached Kabul, and a few days later, they were received by King Habibullah. After a great deal of talk the King said: "You show your wares and then we shall see whether they suit us". Many official meetings were held between the mission and the Afghan officials, as a result of which a Provisional Government of India was established on the 1st December, 1915. Raja Mahendra Pratap became its President, Barkatullah[31] was appointed Prime Minister, and Obeidullah[32] got the portfolio of the Home Minister. Secretaries also were appointed from among the Indians. This Provisional Government dealt directly with the Afghan Government, and even a treaty was drawn up between the two. This Provisional Government sent several missions, issued many proclamations, sent the letters of the German Chancellor to the Indian princes, and even tried to come to some kind of understanding with Russia. The Raja, as President of the Provisional Government of India, wrote a letter to the Czar of Russia on a plate of solid gold, but this Russian negotiation for the time being came to nothing, though on a later occasion Mahendra Pratap was personally received by Trotsky. A special messenger carried the German Chancellor's letter to the King of Nepal. Unfortunately, no tangible results followed, and Mahendra Pratap returned to Berlin and had another interview with the Kaiser in 1918. He suggested that an International Socialist Army comprising the German, Austrian, Bulgarian, Turkish and Russian socialists should be organized, as it could easily cross Soviet Russia and help India to make herself free. But this suggestion was not accepted, though a German officer assured the Raja that the Germans would go through Soviet Russia and march across north Persia to help him in India.

Subsequent to this, the Raja spent many years in travelling to Japan, China, Russia and other countries in order to promote a rebellion in India, but without success, and it is needless to give any details which can be easily found in his autobiography.

Though the efforts of Raja Mahendra Pratap did not practically yield any important result, his was a remarkable

career solely devoted to the cause of India, and one must admire his sacrifice and honour him. He raised the dignity of revolutionary India in various countries, particularly in Germany, Persia, Afghanistan and Russia.

IV REVOLUTIONARY ACTIVITIES IN INDIA DURING THE FIRST WORLD WAR

A. BENGAL

Reference has been made above[35a] to the "terrorist" activities in Bengal, namely, murder of Officials and political dacoities during the War. The news of the Berlin Committee and the Ghadar Party in U.S.A. had a great reaction in India. As soon as the Indian revolutionaries came to know that arrangement had been made by Germany for sending arms to India and a large number of Panjabi revolutionaries were coming from U.S.A. to join them, the plan of a general rising took a dtfinite shape. At last the day, long hoped for, had arrived. Brisk preparations were made for receiving and safely storing the arms—a work of extraordinary difficulty—and making elaborate plans for an armed revolution.

It is difficult to give an accurate account of the plans and activities of the revolutionary groups in Bengal, for we have no other source of information except the accounts given by some revolutionaries, long after the events had taken place. A careful perusal of these, however, shows that the account given in the Sedition Committee's report, though very brief, sums up the main incidents, with fair accuracy, so far as it goes. We may therefore reproduce it substantially and then supplement it by other reliable information as is available.

"Early in 1915 certain of the Bengal revolutnonaries met and decided to organize and put the whole scheme of raising a rebellion in India with the help of Germans upon a proper footing, establishing co-operation between revolutionaries in Siam and other places with Bengal and getting into touch with the Germans, and that funds should be raised by dacoities.

"Thereupon the Garden Reach and Beliaghata dacoities were committed on the 12th January and 22nd February which brought in Rs. 40,000. Bholanath Chatterji had already been sent to Bangkok to get in touch with conspirators there. Jitendra Nath Lahiri, who arrived in Bombay from Europe early in March, brought to the Bengal revolutionaries offers of German help and invited them to send an agent to Batavia to co-operate. A meeting was thereupon held, as a result of which Naren Bhattacharji was sent to Batavia to discuss plans with the Germans there. He started in April, and adopted the pseudonym of C. Martin. In the same month another Bengali, Abani Mukherji, was sent by the conspirators to Japan, while the leader, Jatin Mukherji, went into hiding at Balasore owing to the police investigations in connection with the Garden Reach and Beliaghata dacoities. In the same month the S. S. *Maverick,* (to which reference has been made above[32 b]) started on a voyage from San Pedro in California.

"On his arrival at Batavia "Martin" was introduced by the German Consul to Theodor Helfferich, who stated that a cargo of arms and ammunition was on its way to Karachi to assist the Indians in a revolution. "Martin" then urged that the ship should be diverted to Bengal. This was eventually agreed to after reference to the German Consul-General in Shanghai. "Martin" then returned to make arrangements to receive the cargo of the *Maverick*, as the ship was called, at Rai Mangal in the Sundarbans. The cargo was said to consist of 30,000 rifles with 400 rounds of ammunition each and 2 lakhs of rupees. Meanwhile "Martin" had telegraphed to Harry & Sons in Calcutta, a bogus firm kept by a well-known revolutionary, that "business was helpful." In June Harry & Sons wired to "Martin" for money, and then began a series of remittances from Helfferich in Batavia to Harry & Sons in Calcutta between June and August, which aggregated Rs. 43,000, of which the revolutionaries received Rs. 33,000 before the authorities discovered what was going on.

"Martin" returned to India in the middle of June, and the conspirators Jatin Mukherji, Jadu Gopal Mukherjee,, Narendra Bhattacharji ("Martin"), Bholanath Chatterji, and Atul Ghosh set about making plans to receive the *Maverick's* cargo and

employ it to the best advantage. They decided to divide the arms into three parts, to be sent respectively to

(a) Hatia, for the Eastern Bengal districts, to be worked by the members of the Barisal party.

(2) Calcutta.

(3) Balasore.

"They considered that they were numerically strong enough to deal with the troops in Bengal, but they feared reinforcements from outside. With this idea in view they decided to hold up the three main railways into Bengal by blowing up the principal bridges. Jatindra was to deal with Madras railway from Balasore, Bholanath Chatterji was sent to Chakradharpur to take charge of the Bengal-Nagpur Railway, while Satish Chakrabarti was to go to Ajay and blow up the bridge on the East Indian Railway Naren Chaudhuri and Phanindra Chakrabarti were told off to go to Hatia, where a force was to collect, first, to obtain control of the Eastern Bengal districts, and then to march on to Calcutta. The Calcutta party, under Naren Bhattacharji and Bepin Ganguli, were first to take possession of all the arms and arsenals around Calcutta, then to take Fort William, and afterwards to sack the town of Calcutta The German officers arriving in the *Maverick* were to stay in Eastern Bengal and raise and train armies.

"In the meantime, the work of taking delivery of the cargo of the *Maverick* was apparently arranged by Jadu Gopal Mukherji who is said to have placed himself in communication with a zamindar in the vicinity of Rai Mangal, who had promised to provide men, lighters, etc., for the unloading of the vessel The *Maverick* would arrive at night and would be recognised by a series of lamps hung horizontally. It was hoped that the first distribution of arms would take place by the 1st of July 1915.

"There was no doubt that some men, under instructions from Atul Ghosh, actually went down by boat to the neighbourhood of Rai Mangal to help in the unloading of the *Maverick*. They seemed to have stayed there about ten days, but by the end of June the *Maverick* had not arrived, nor had any message been received from Batavia to explain the delay.

"While the conspirators were waiting for the *Maveirick* a Bengali arrived from Bangkok on the 3rd July with a message

from Atmaram, a Panjabi conspirator there, that the German Consul in Siam was sending by boat a consignment of 5,000 rifles and ammunition and 1 lakh of rupees to Rai Mangal. The conspirators thinking this was in substitution of the *Maverick's* cargo induced the Bengali messenger to return to Bangkok via Batavia and tell Helfferich not to change the original plan and that other consignments of arms might be landed at Hatia (Sandwip) and Balasore in the Bay of Bengal or Gokarni on the west coast of India, south of Karwar. In July Government learnt of the projected landing of arms at Rai Mangal and took precautions."[33]

The account quoted above from the Report of the Sedition (Rowlatt) Committee is corroborated by the Statements of prominent revolutionary leaders like Jadugopal Mukherji who took a prominent part in the great campaign which proved a failure because the *S. S. Maverick* never arrived, as has been mentioned above. But a few details may be added from other sources.

The real name of Jatin, referred to in the second para of the Report quoted above as "the Léader", is Jyotindra Mukherji. He was a remarkable personality and may be regarded as 'the bravest of the brave' among the large number of brave Bengalis who joined the revolutionary movement. He was called Bagha (Tiger) Jatin as he had killed a royal Bengal tiger with a dagger in a jungle. Very high tributes have been paid to him by another eminent leader, Jadugopal Mukherjee, in his autobiography. Thus he observes: "Jyotindranath and danger were brothers, the former was always present wherever the latter was or his presence was expected." Again, "Jyotindranath belonged to a much higher category of men and towered high above the revolutionaries who had gathered round him." Born in 1880 Jyotindra was senior in age to most of the revolutionaries who came into prominence during the second decade of the present century. He was not averse to violence like the Anusilan group represented by Jadugopal Mukherji and was the brain behind many of the murders and dacoities mentioned above on pages 271 to 279. But he laid great stress on the Guerilla warfare and not unoften suggested adventures like storming the Fort William in Calcutta, which astounded his followers, quite large in number. He may be regarded as the leader of the section which revived the cult

of violence in Bengal after the group of Barin Ghose was removed from the scene after the Alipore Conspiracy case (pp. 259 ff.). In the movement for organising a general rising with the help of arms sent from U.S.A. he was the leader, so far at least as Bengal was concerned,[34] and his heroic death as a result of this unsuccessful venture may be told in some details.

In order to facilitate the unloading of arms sent from U.S.A. a firm was opened by Hari Kumar Chakrabarti under the name "Harry and Sons", with a branch called "Universal Emporium" at Balasore. As noted in the above account, money was sent from Batavia to "Harry and Sons," but out of Rs. 43,000 only Rs. 33,000 reached them. The last instalment of Rs. 10,000 (according to some account, 12,000) fell into the hands of the Government. Through a deplorable oversight, while cashing the Bank-draft in favour of "Harry and Sons," their man brought notes of the denomination of Rs. 100, and the number of these notes gave a clue to the Government for tracing the firm, and what was worse, its connection with the Balasore Branch.

On August 7, 1915, the Police searched the premises of Harry and Sons and arrested some revolutionaries. They then turned their attention to Balasore where Jyotindra Mukherji had gone with his associates to receive the German arms. A detailed account of how the plot was unearthed and Jyotindra (referred to as Jatin) Mukherji being challenged by the police, died after a heroic fight, is described as follows in a Confidential Police report.[35]

"Various remittances, totalling over Rs. 40,000, were received in Calcutta from Batavia, of which all but Rs. 10,000 actually reached and was cashed by the revolutionaries, the latter amount having been intercepted by the Poilce. The first remittance was brought in the shape of a bank draft in favour of one A. A. Martin or bearer, by a young Bengali, who arrived in Negapatam on 14 June. A telegram was also sent from Madras on 15th June to Jadugopal Mukherji in Calcutta, in which the sender intimated that he was going to Balasore, where he expected to meet someone.

"The Police proceedings in Calcutta included the search of various addresses discovered through the Batavia telegram and the arrest of two brothers, Hari Kumar and Makhan Lal Chakra-

varti and their assistant Shyam Sundar Basu, of 41 Clive Street, a bogus firm going under the name of Harry & Sons.

"Previous to the discovery of the Madras telegram to Jadugopal, a connection between Harry and Sons and a cycle emporium at Balasore started by one Saileswar Basu, brother of Shyam Sundar Basu, assistant in Harry & Sons, had been brought to notice. When, therefore, early in September the telegram from Madras came to light, immediate steps were taken at Balasore, the emporium was searched, and Saileswar and his assistant Nimai Chakravarti *alias* Tarapada arrested. In the search a letter from one 'Gopal' was seized and this connection proved subsequently a most important one. It was proved that Saileswar had made an expedition by boat early in August along the low level canal, which follows the coastline and joins a river navigable by country boats. He was most inquisitive during the trip, constantly asking the local Bengali, whose boat he went in, regarding roads, houses and ghats. When arrested he denied all knowledge of the trip, although the Bengali and the boatman all spoke to it.

"The Gopal, whose letter was seized at the search, was proved to have been a frequent visitor to Saileswar. He was found to have taken some land at Kaptipada, in Mayurbhanj, about 30 miles from Balasore, some months previously. On the 6th September, several police officers and the District Magistrate set out on bicycles for Kaptipada, arriving there at night. The next morning the house was searched. The occupants had decamped during the night. A fairly comfortable house, situated in the midst of dense jungle, had been put up, and attached to it was a wrestling ground; a tree close by was found riddled with bullets; it had evidently had a target placed against it. Some local-made bullets, a powder flask, a bottle of poison, wrapped up in a piece of paper bearing the address of 41 Clive Street, Calcutta (this was Harry & Son's shop); a careful tracing of a map of the Sundarbans, showing steamer routes, police stations, forest depots, etc., with a steamer route marked on the East of Raimangal Island; swords and spears and two boxes were found. In one of the boxes was a cutting from the *'Penang Times'* giving an account of the mysterious ship, *'Maverick'*, which was to have brought the arms. Gopal was well known in the locality

and it was discovered that two of the gang had started a shop at Taldiha, 20 miles further inland in Mayurbhanj State. A party set off to search this place and arrangements were made to block all roads and a systematic search was set on foot for the suspects. Villagers were instructed to be on the look out.

"On 9th September, three days after the search at Kaptipada, thanks to the intelligent and plucky behaviour of the villagers of Durpal, the gang were brought to book in almost sensational manner. Five Bengalis, travel-stained and weary on arrival at Durpal, a village north of Balasore, finding they had a river to cross, demanded passage from a boatman and were eventually rowed over by another man, who noticed they were strangers and questioned them. Suspicious of their appearances, he informed the village chaukidar, and in the meanwhile a number of villagers collected and after some discussion demanded an explanation of the strangers as to their idenity and destination, before allowing them to proceed. Some of the gang thereupon produced revolvers and threatened the crowd, which fell back, but continued to follow the gang at a safe distance. One of the party then turned and fired two or three shots. As nothing happened, two of the bolder villagers drew closer, whereupon four of the party fired a volley killing the foremost and severely wounding the other. The crowd however refused to let the desperados go. Messengers were sent to Balasore and met on the way one of the road-patrol Sub-Inspectors, who sent the messages on and himself hurried to the spot, mixed with the crowd and followed the fugitives, who, crossing another small river and too exhausted to proceed further, made for some high ground in a paddy field and took up a defensive position there. The District Magistrate arrived at the spot shortly after and then a party of armed police. The Sub-Inspector with the villagers had put up a white flag as a signal and thus the armed party soon located their quarry. They marched out in open order across the paddy field, and were immediately fired on by the fugitives, and then a regular fight ensured [35a] for some 15 or 20 minutes, at the end of which two of the Bengalis stood up in surrender. The gang were thereupon secured and it was found that one of them had been shot dead and two others were seriously wounded. Three Mauser pistols and an automatic Mauser

pistol and quantity of cartridges were recovered from them and they were taken into Balasore, where one of the wounded men died in hospital not long after. The three Mauser pistols were part of the consignment stolen from Messrs. Rodda & Co.

It was then discovered that the party consisted of:

1. Jatindra Nath Mukherji (mortally wounded).
2. Chittapriya Ray Chaudhuri (killed).
3. Manoranjan Sen Gupta.
4. Nirendra (not Jitendra as given in the Report) Chandra Das Gupta.
5. Jyotish Pal (wounded),

all but the last being important absconders from Bengal, the first two being wanted for murder."

Manoranjan and Nirendra were hanged. Jyotish Pal was transported to the Andamans, became insane and died in Jail at Berhampore in Bengal. Jatindra died next day. His real name is Jyotindra and his activities have been mentioned above, on p. 411.

B. THE PANJAB

1. Muslim Conspiracy.

The Muslims, generally speaking, did not take any active part in the revolutionary activities in India described above. But there was still a small colony of the old Wahabis—Mujahidins—in the independent territory beyond the North-West Frontier Province, who cherished the old idea of carrying on *jihad* against the British. As noted above (pp. 224 ff.), a radical change had come over Muslim politics in India since the Wahabi Movement of the sixties, and the forlorn Mujahidins found little sympathy and less support from their Indian brethren in faith. According to official report, however, the small 'Mujahidin Colony' was "frequently assisted by recruits and funds" from Indian Muslims. They "took part in various border wars, and in 1915 were concerned in the rising which led up to the engagements at Rustam and Shabkadr. Twelve of their number, dressed in the customary black robes, were found dead on the field after the latter.[36]

Turkey's entry into the War against Britain in 1914 caused a strong anti-British feeling among Indian Muslims. In February, 1915, fifteen young Muslim students from Lahore and seve-

ral from Peshawar and Kohat joined the *Mujahidins* and later moved to Kabul. Such revolutionary sentiments were not confined to the Punjab. "In January, 1917, it was discovered that a party of eight Muhammadans had joined the *Mujahidins* from the districts of Rangpur and Dacca in Eastern Bengal. In March, 1917, two Bengali Muhammadans were arrested in the North-West Frontier Province with Rs. 8,000 in their possession which they were conveying to the fanatical colony. These two men had been for some time themselves *Mujahidin* and had been sent down to their native district to collect subscriptions."[37]

There is evidence that these isolated instances were part of, or at least inspired by, a general Muslim conspiracy in India against the British. The leader of this movement was Maulavi Obeidullah of the Muslim religious school at Deoband (Shaharanpur District, U.P.), and he was assisted by Maulana Mahmud Hasan, the Head Maulavi of the school. They conceived the project of destroying British rule in India by means of an attack on the North-West Frontier, synchronizing with a Muslim rebellion in India. With this object in view Obeidullah got into touch with the *Mujahidins* and left secretly for Kabul where he met the other revolutionaries from India. They were interned and some Indian revolutionaries who were on trial in India but had escaped to Afghanistan were in chains, but they were all released at the request of Mahendra Pratap, who led a mission to Kabul.[38]

Shortly after Obeidullah left for Kabul, Maulana Mahmud Hasan, accompanied by Mian Ansari and a few others, left for the Hedjaj tract of Arabia. There they got into communication with Ghalib Pasha, then Turkish Military Governor of the Hedjaj, and obtained from him a declaration of *jihad* (Holy War) against the British. Mian Ansari proceeded with this document—known as Ghalibnama—to Kabul, distributing copies of it on his way both in India and among the frontier tribes. By the time Ansari reached Kabul the Indian revolutionaries were favourably received by the Amir of Kabul and established a Provisional Government with Obeidullah as Home Minister, as noted above (p. 407). Encouraged by his success Obeidullah wrote a long letter to Mahmud Hasan urging him to secure the active co-operation of the Turkish Government and of the Sherif of Mecca and

describing the scheme of a Pan-Islamic army—the "Army of God"—with headquarters at Medina, and subordinate commands at Constantinople, Teheran and Kabul. There were other letters describing the progress of revolutionary activities in Kabul. These letters were dated 9th July, 1916, and were addressed to an agent in Sindh with instructions to forward by a reliable messenger, or convey them in person, to Mahmud Hasan. They were carried to India by a family servant of two students—two brothers—who had left Lahore and gone to Kabul.

The "letters were written neatly in Persian on lengths of yellow silk and sewn up inside the lining of his coat. The servant met the father of the two boys with their news, but the old man's suspicions having been roused he extorted a confession from the servant and got possession of the silk-letters. These he handed over to the British authorities who got 'valuable information as to the sympathisers in India'. interned about dozen persons, and took other 'necessary preventive measures.' Thus ended the "Silk letter" conspiracy. Fortunately for the British 'the revolt of the Sherif of Mecca against the Turks, in June, 1916, divided Islam, and knocked the bottom out of the project for combined Muslim action against British India.[39]

There was great provocation among a section of the Muslims at the conduct of the Sherif of Mecca, but all agitation and meetings of protest were stopped by the Government of the Punjab. "The Government of India made it clear that they would not tolerate any condemnation of the Sherif, who had declared himself to be the ally of the British Government and who was freeing his own people from Turkish oppression."[40]

2. Activities of the Revolutionaries Returning from America.

As mentioned above, towfold activities were going on in U.S.A. While the Indo-German conspiracy was busy with the efforts to send arms and ammunitions to India the Ghadar Party devoted its main energy to sending Indians, mostly Punjabis, imbued with revolutionary ideas, back to their country to stir up rebellion there. Ram Chandra and his associates carried on a whirlwind campaign urging the Indians to take advantage of the Great War that was then going on. They pointed out that here

was a unique opportunity to drive the English out of India. They must go back to India in thousands to liberate their mother-land from the British yoke, in co-operation with their countrymen alreay engaged in the work. The powder magazine was there and only a spark was needed to explode it. They should serve as that spark. Once the advantage was lost it would never recur. List was made of those who voluntéered to go back to India, and funds were collected for the expenses of the journey. The movement found ready response from Indian settlers in all parts of the World,—Canada, Japan, Shanghai, Hongkong, Manila, Singapore, British Guiana, Fiji and South Africa—who helped it with men and money. About three thousand men reached India in different batches, at different times, and through various routes.

The Government of India were fully informed of this movement of the Ghadar Party and took all precautions. In order to check the arrival of the revolutionaries in India the Government of India had passed the Ingress Ordinance on 5th September, 1914. The *S. S. Korea* which sailed from San Francisco on August 29, 1914, had on board about sixty revolutionaries, including some of the most prominent leaders. Nearly a hundred joined them on the way. They were detained at Hongkong and changed to another ship, the *Tosa Maru*, which arrived at Calcutta with 173 passengers, mostly Sikhs, from America, Manila, Shanghai and Hongkong. One hundred of these men were interned. Shiploads of returning emigrants came during the next two months. In spite of Government precautions and internments, a large number of persons from outside reached India. The estimate of their number varies between three to five thousand, excluding 400 kept in jail, and 2,500, whose movements were confined to their villages.

Regular instructions had been given to the returning revolutionaries about their programme of work in the Punjab. There was to be a general rising all over India as soon as German arms and ammunitions were received. As a preliminary to this, seditious ideas were to be spread among the Indian soldiers, not only in India, but also among those stationed at Hongkong, Singapore, Penang, Rangoon and other places through which they passed. As the ships were detained for long periods at important ports,

the revolutionary Sikhs took advantage of it to invite the local Sikh soldiers at Gurdwaras and delivered seditious speeches to them.

The work to be done in the Punjab was also definitely laid down. While still on board the vessels on their way to India the Ghadar booklet, *Ghadar-i-ganj* (Echo of Mutiny), was read at intervals to keep up the revolutionary spirit. The booklet enjoins:

"We should commit dacoity on the Government and awake the whole of the Punjab.' 'Rob Europeans of their money and bring it to your own use.' And Nawab Khan, the first important Ghadar approver, stated in Court that one of the resolutions passed on the *Tosa Maru* was that loyal Punjabis of substance should be looted.[41] In keeping with this spirit the men were asked to rouse popular feelings against the British and organize secret societies or join existing ones. They were to collect money by looting or dacoities.

That these instructions were followed admits of no doubt, though no authentic account is available as to the extent to which they were carried out. According to the Punjab Government, the revolutionaries assembled at Amritsar in October, 1914, when plans for waging war against the English were discussed. Thereafter such meetings took place off and on in which plans for general rising with the help of troops and for committing dacoities were matured.

"The judgment of the first Lahore Tribunal recites five notable cases in which these intentions were carried out. But besides these cases the following other outrages were committed by turbulent men, believed or suspected to be mainly returned emigrants, during the months of December, 1914, and January and February, 1915:—

(a Dacoities at Pharala and Karnama in the Jullundur district on the 24th and 25th of December.

(b) Two robberies in the Ferozepore district on the same dates.

(c) A dacoity at Chowrian, Gurdaspore district, on the 27th December.

(d) Dacoities on the 1st and 4th of January in the Hoshiar-

pur and Jullundur districts. One of these was accompanied by the murder of a village watchman.

(e) An attack by eight Sikhs on the house of a Canal Sub-overseer in the Montgomery district. The owner's arm was broken by a revolver bullet.

(f) A dacoity at Sri Gobindpur in the Gurdaspore district on the 16th of the same month.

(g The plundering of some Hindu shops on the 21st of January at a town in the Kapurthala State. Some of the gang were subsequently arrested with some seditious literature, 245 rounds of ammunition and a revolver.

We now come to the "political" dacoities proved in Court:—

(a) The first of these was perpetrated on the 23rd of January. Ornaments were taken from the family of a Hindu shop-keeper at Sahenewal in the Ludhiana district. The unfortunate man, his wife and daughter-in-law were beaten. He died of his injuries. The booty obtained was small.

(b) On the 27th of January, 10 or 15 dacoits attacked the house of a Hindu in the Mansuran village of the same district. They took away a large amount of booty which was used for revolutionary purposes. They assaulted a woman and a boy, proclaiming to the assembled villagers that they were collecting money to turn out the British and would be assisted by the Germans. Villagers who opposed the robbers were fired at and bombed. Some students from Ludhiana were implicated in this outrage.

(d) On the 2nd of February, for the same purpose, revolutionaries robbed a house at Chabba in the Amritsar district. They were armed with bombs, pistols and clubs. They murdered the owner of the house, but were attacked by a group of villagers who captured one, drove off the rest, and only desisted from pursuit when some had been injured and mutilated for life by the dacoits. In this enterprise the revolutionaries were assisted by local bad characters ; and then it was that the police authorities began to get into touch, through a spy, with the whole organization, and discovered that an enterprise, far larger than any yet undertaken, was in process of incubation. But before coming to this we should mention—

(e) A dacoity at Rabon Unchi in the Ludhiana district on

the 3rd February, where a woman was robbed of property worth Rs. 4,198 which was devoted to revolutionary purposes.

"There had too been attempts at derailing trains on the 3rd, 6th, 7th, 15th, 18th, and 21st of January. Moreover, on the 12th of February, a police guard consisting of one Head Constable and four Constables stationed on a railway bridge in the Amritsar district were menaced by a gang of eight or ten men"[42]

The following excerpt taken from the prosecution statement in the third Supplementary Lahore Conspiracy Case gives an exhaustive list of the various actions and conspiracies in which, according to the Government view, the Chadarites had participated. It is difficult to say how far these charges, like the judgments of the Tribunal, were based on facts, but we may regard them as conveying a fairly accurate idea of the nature and extent of their activities.

"That in pursuance of the said conspiracy in and out of British India war was waged against His Majesty the King-Emperor and in particular—

1. Efforts were made to seduce Indian soldiers and to cause them to mutiny and join the conspiracy. Such efforts were made at

(a) Hong Kong and Ferozepore, on sepoys of the 26th Punjab Infantry, a few of whom joined.

(b) Ambala, on the sowars and others of the 9th Hodson's Horse.

(c) Meerut, on the sowars of the 12th Cavalry and Sepoys of the 28th Pioneers, a few of whom joined and 4 of whom have been convicted and hanged.

(d) Chak No. 5 Sargodha, on sowars of the 22nd Cavalry.

(e) Lahore Cantonments, on sowars of the 23rd Cavalry, a number of whom joined, of whom seventeen have been convicted and twelve hanged,

(f) Fyzabad, Benaras, Cawnpore, Allahabad and Agra on the Indian troops stationed there.

(g) Bannu and Nowshera and elsewhere.

2. Preparations were made on the 27th November, 1914, to force and plunder the Government treasury at Moga and a party of the said conspirators set out from Ferozepore for the purpose, but were met by Bisharat Ali, Sub-Inspector of Police,

and others, and stopped, which resulted in the conspirators murdering the Sub-Inspector and Jawala Singh Zaildar and the subsequent death of Dhian Singh and Chanda Singh, two of the conspirators, whilst resisting arrest, and the conviction and hanging of eleven others.

3. Dacoities were committed (as already described above, on the authority of Sedition Committee Report), and the proceeds of the said dacoities were retained for the purpose of the conspiracy.

4. Other dacoities and raids on police thanas were attempted which did not succeed or were abandoned.

5. Money was collected for the purposes of the conspiracy.

6. Bombs and materials for bombs were obtained, and bombs were manufactured.

7. Some arms and ammunitions were obtained and efforts were made to obtain or purchase more.

8. Meetings, particularly at Ladhowal, Moga, Bhadowal, Jhar Sahib, Kairon, Amritsar, Lahore, Dhudari, Dhudhar and Gujarwal were held and plans particularly to print seditious literature, seduce troops, loot treasuries and thanas, manufacture bombs, procure arms, murder loyal subjects and officials, destroy railway and telegraphs, seduce villagers, and commit dacoities in furtherance of the cause, were made.

9. Dates were fixed for the outbreak of the rebellion and men were collected for the purpose, particularly at Lahore, on the 25th November, 1914, at Jhar Sahib and Kairon at the end of November, and at Lahore and Ferozepore on the 19th February, 1915.

10. Seditious and revolutionary literature, including the *Ghadar*, *History of India* by Bhai Parmanand, and pamphlets entitled *Ghadr-i-Ganj*, *Ghadr Sandesa* and *Allan-i-jang*, were printed and circulated. The last-named purports to be a declaration of war.

11. Seditious speeches were made.

12. Members of the conspiracy visited towns and villages to induce men to join.

13. Youths in schools, particularly at Ludhiana, and villagers were seduced and induced to join.

14. Head Constable Mashum Ali Shah was, on the 20th

February, 1915, murdered, and Sub-Inspector Muhammad Musa wounded by Arjan Singh *alias* Sajjan Singh, one of the conspirators returned from America, in Anarkali Bazar, Lahore. Arjan Singh has since been convicted and hanged.

15. Chanda Singh, Zaildar, was murdered on the 25th April, 1915.

16. Kapur Singh, a witness against the conspirators in Lahore Conspiracy Case, was murdered on the 2nd August, 1915.

17. An attack on the regimental guard on the Walla Canal bridge, Amritsar, for the purpose of obtaining rifles and ammunitions, was made on the 12th June, 1915, when two sepoys were murdered, others were wounded and six rifles, accoutrements and a lage quantity of rifle ammunition were carried off and, subsequently in the pursuit, two other men were murdered.

18. A large number collected in Kapurthala State with the intention of looting the State Treasury of arms, ammunitions and money.

C. THE GENERAL RISING

It would appear from what has been said above that the revolutionaries, both in Bengal and the Punjab, were inspired by the idea of a general rising in India against the British. The situation was very favourable. India was denuded of troops, as they were sent to fight in the various theatres of war in Europe, Asia and Africa. While England was in extreme difficulty owing to the overwhelming German successes at the beginning of the war, considerable help was expected from Germany, Turkey, and Afghanistan. Germany was to supply arms and ammunitions to India, Turkey's support would influence the Indian Muslims to array themselves against the English, and Afghanistan would create a diversion either by an actual invasion of India or by assuming a hostile attitude which would compel the British to maintain a big army at the North-West Frontier, leaving the rest of India comparatively weak and defenceless. It offered a splendid opportunity to the Indian revolutionaries to launch the armed insurrection for which they 'had been preparing for a long time.

The most outstanding figure in this movement was the

famous rvolutionary leader, Rash Bihari Bose. He belonged to the Chandernagore group of revolutionists and was a Government official at Dehradun. Even while occupying this post, he kept in touch with the revolutionary workers in Bengal, particularly those of Chandernagore and Dacca Anusilan Samiti. These two bodies were induced by him and others to work together and Rash Bihari took charge of organizing the revolutionary activities in North India. The most remarkable of Bose's exploits was the throwing of a bomb at Lord Hardinge in December, 1912, when he was going in a ceremonial procession through the Chawk of Delhi.[43] The bomb, which injured the Viceroy and killed one of his attendants, was actually thrown by Basanta Kumar Biswas, but Rash Bihari was the brain of the organization and actually secured a bomb from Calcutta for this purpose. Basanta, disguised as a woman, took his seat in a place reserved for ladies, and while the general attention was distracted by the arrival of the procession, he threw the bomb and left the place.[43a] Rash Bihari was waiting for him, and both managed to leave Delhi. Rash Bihari returned to Dehradun and organized a meeting to protest against the "dastardly attempt on the life of the Viceroy", he himself denouncing the outrage in the strongest language. He thanked God that Lord Hardinge's life was saved, though he suffered some injury and one of his attendants was killed.

It was not, however, long before his complicity in the plot was either definitely known to the police or suspected by them. As soon as Rash Bihari came to know of this, he left Dehradun and hid himself. Such was his wonderful power of putting on disguises that though the police made a most vigorous search for him and offered a reward of Rs. 7,500 for his arrest, he always eluded their vigilance and continued his revolutionary work. Many authentic stories are told about his escapes by fairly credible persons which read almost like romance

Rash Bihari chose Banaras as his centre of activity, and stayed there throughout the greater part of 1914. A revolutionary centre had already been set up there by some revolutionaries of Bengal, and the brain of the organization there was a young Bengali school student named Sachindra Nath Sanyal, to whom reference has been made above.[44] In the year 1908 he

had started a club called the Anusilan Samiti, named after the organization of this name in Dacca. It was really an independent body, but when the latter was declared illegal, the name of the club was changed to "Young Men's Association." The ostensible object of the Association was the moral, intellectual and physical improvement of the members, but it was used by Sachindra for preaching disaffection against the Government and recruiting new members for revolutionary work. His method of work and nature of activities will be evident from what has been said above about his relations with Bankim Chandra Mitra.

Some time in 1913 Sachindra went to Calcutta to procure bombs, and established contact with the Rajabazar (Calcutta) Centre of the Anusilan Samiti. Here he made the acquaintance of Suresh Chandra Ghosh, a notable member of the Chandernagore revolutionary group, who introduced him to Rash Bihari. Rash Bihari was attracted by this energetic young man, but before finally deciding to join his group, sent Pratul Ganguly, member of the Dacca Anusilan Samiti, to accompany Sachindra to the different centres of his activity. These two visited Banaras, Kanpur, Lakhnau, Agra, Ayodhya, Allahabad and other places. Pratul reported on his return that Sachindra had a good organization at Banaras, but though he had workers in other centres, they were not yet well organized. Thereupon Rash Bihari, with Sachindra as his chief lieutenant, shifted his residence to Banaras and took charge of the movement. Here he was joined by a large number of active members, both from Bengal and outside, the most notable of the latter being Vinayak Rao Kaple, Damodar Swarup, Pratap Sinha, Avadh Bihari, Balmukund, Bachcha Singh, Kartar Singh, and a Maratha named Vishnu Ganesh Pingley, many of whom had returned from America in 1914 in the company of the Sikhs of the Ghadar Party.

Pingley informed Rash Bihari that "four thousand men had come from America for the purpose of rebellion and that there were twenty thousand more there who would come when rebellion broke out." Rash Bihari directed his main attention to propaganda work among the Indian soldiers with a view to inducing them to join in the general rebellion against the British which was planned to take place simultaneously all over North India. Sachindra, in his autobiography, has given a very inte-

resting and detailed account of the method followed in order to get into touch with the soldiers of the cantonment, and how after gradually gaining their confidence, his party broached the subject of rebellion, and secured their promise to join. It is very difficult to get an accurate idea of the extent of their activities and the degree of success attained in this direction. Sachindra says in a general way that they contacted the Indian soldiers of all cantonments in North India from Dinapore to Jullundur, and while most of the regiments promised to join the rebellion after it had actually broken out, only two regiments in the Punjab agreed to begin the rebellion.

Rash Bihari sent his most trusted lieutenants to work among the soldiers of the various cantonments—Damodar Swarup to Allahabad, Priyanath and Bibhuti to Banaras, Bisvanath Pande to Ramnagar, Mangal Pande and Dilla Singh to Secrole, and Nalini Mukherji to Jubbulpore. Pingley, Kartar Singh and a few others visited the cantonments at Lahore, Ambala, Ferozepore, Rawalpindi and Meerut and preached the message of independence among the Indian soldiers. These, we are told, responded to their appeal to seize this golden opportunity of winning the independence of India—an opportunity which may never come again.

The general plan of the rebellion has been outlined as follows by Sachindra. On a particular night fixed beforehand, the sepoys in the cantonments all over North India would suddenly attack the English soldiers; those who surrendered would be imprisoned (and the rest would presumably be killed). During the same night the telegraph wires would be cut, Englishmen—both volunteers and other adult civilians—imprisoned, treasury looted, and prisoners released from jail. Having done all this and elected somebody to take charge of the administration of the place, the revolutionaries would assemble at Lahore.

This revolutionary plan was based on the fact that there was a very small number of English troops in India at the time, consisting mostly of young raw recruits of Territorial Force.[44a] These could be easily overpowered, and the arms and ammunitions stored in the different cantonments were regarded as sufficient for carrying on the fight for one year. It was thought that if the revolutionary struggle could be carried on for at least one

year, the rivalry of European nations, the assistance of the enemies of the English and the international situation would help India to attain her freedom.

As the rebellion was intended to be a general one the revolutionary groups in Bengal were duly informed about the plan, so that they might make necessary arrangement for a simultaneous rising among the civil population. In particular they were asked to supply bombs in large quantities. It appears from the statements and reminiscences of several Bengali revolutionaries that the news of impending rebellion created a great excitement all over Bengal. Preparations were made for securing money by dacoities and collecting information about the number and whereabouts of licensed guns and revolvers, district by district, the amount of arms in different police stations which could be secured by sudden attack, means of looting treasuries, modes of transport other than railways, the possibility of securing support of the Sonthals, etc. etc. Revolutionary leaders contacted the Sikh troops stationed at Dacca through letters of introduction sent by the Sikh soldiers of Lahore, and succeeded in winning them over. There was a stir among young men of Bengal. Revolutionary groups gained new recruits, military training was imparted to them in the jungles, and theft of guns and revolvers increased to a considerable extent. Half-pants were sent to different centres, depots of foodstuff were established, and a list was made of local motors, lorries, and other conveyances. A vague sense of an impending rebellion was somehow created among the people from Dacca to Lahore, and bombs were safely brought from Bengal to Banaras and thence to Lahore.

After the arrangements had made some progresss Rash Bihari himself proceeded to Lahore via Delhi. February 21, 1915, was fixed as the date of simultaneous rising all over India. But a police informer, Kripal Singh, who had managed to enrol himself as a member of Rash Bihari's Party, secretly communicated the date to the police. As soon as this was known, the date was changed to 19th February. But though Kripal Singh was kept under strict surveillance, he managed to send words to the police about the change of the date. The Government immediately removed the suspected regiments to other places and made a large number of arrests. Rash Bihari and Pingley evaded arrest

and safely returned to Banaras. But the whole plot miscarried and the elaborate plan came to nought.

Nothing dunted, Pingley again went to Meerut to work among the Indian soldiers. He was arrested on March 23, 1915, in the lines of the 12th Indian Cavalry with a tin box in his possession, containing ten bombs "sufficient to annihilate half a regiment."

Pingley and sixty others were tried in the Lahore Conspiracy Case. The following items of charge in the Lahore Conspiracy Cases give some idea of the revolutionary conspiracy as known to the Government. The accuracy of details cannot be verified, but on the whole they convey a fair idea of the general situation.

"That large numbers of the conspirators assembled at Lahore Cantonments on the 25th November, 1914, with intent to attack troops stationed there and loot arms and then start the rebellion, and that, owing to the failure of their plans, large numbers of the conspirators met at Ferozepore Cantonments on the 26th November with intent to loot the arsenal for arms and start the rebellion with the aid of mutinous troops stationed there.

'That a meeting of the conspirators was held at Dudhari about the 17th February, 1915, at which a revolutionary speech was delivered and the conspirators were exhorted to rise in rebellion and to collect men and join in the proposed Ferozepore raid on the 19th February, 1915.

"That large number of conspirators took part in the gathering and proposed raid on the arsenal at Ferozepore on the night of the 19th February, 1915, in pursuance of the agreement and arrangements for a general rising or rebellion on that date.

"That number of conspirators took part in an attempted raid on the military guard on the Doraha Railway bridge on the 21st February, 1915, for the purpose of obtaining rifles in pursuance of the plans of the members of the conspiracy and in furtherance thereof.

"That on the 19th February, 1915, which date was fixed for a general rising of the conspirators, certain premises occupied by the conspirators in Lahore were raided by the police and a number of conspirators were arrested. Owing to some of the conspirators turning approvers and important discoveries being made of seditious literature, arms, ammunition, bombs and

chemicals for bombs, revolutionary flags, implements for cutting telegraph wires, locks and safes, a large number of conspirators were arrested and tried by Commissioners appointed under Act IV of 1915, and were ultimately convicted of waging war, and of conspiracy to wage war, against the King Emperor at three trials generally known by the name of "the Lahore Conspiracy Case" and "the Lahore Supplementary Conspiracy Cases," respectively.

"That, though large numbers of the conspirators were arrested, including the emajority of the leaders, and were tried as stated, the conspiracy continued and further acts in pursuance and furtherance of the conspiracy were committed by members of the conspiracy then at large."

Some of these have already been referred to above.

"Nine batches of conspirators were tried by Special Tribunals constituted under the Defence of India Act. In one of these cases 61 accused were before the court, there were 404 prosecution witnesses, and 228 persons were called as witnesses by the defence. In another the accused numbered 74, the prosecution witnesses 365, and the defence witnesses 1,042. In a third the figures were 12, 86 and 44. As a result of all the cases, 28 persons were hanged, 29 were acquitted, and the rest were sentenced to transportation or imprisonment. Some mutinous soldiers of two regiments were tried by court-martial, and a few murderers, dacoits and train-wreckers were dealt with by the ordinary courts."[45]

V. KOMAGATA MARU.

A special interest attaches to the case of *S. S. Komagata Maru*. It brought back to India a large number of Sikhs from Canada, shortly before the Ghadar heroes returned from America in thousands, and the Government of India regarded the expedition as part of the exodus movement organized by the Ghadar Party. But Baba Gurdit Singh, who chartered the *S. S. Komagata Maru*, denies it *in toto*. He was a Sikh of the Amritsar District, but had emigrated from India in the early years of the 20th century and carried on business at Singapore. In the early part of 1914 he chartered a ship for carrying a large number of

Panjabis to Canada, which already contained about 4,000 Indians, chiefly Punjabis.

The official account of this voyage and its return is thus summed up in the Sedition Committee Report.

"On April the 4th, 1914, the *Komagata Maru* sailed from Hong Kong. At intermediate ports consignment of the Ghadar newspapers were received on board, and at Yokohama two Indian revolutionaries from the United States visited the ship. On the 23rd of May the *Komagata Maru* arrived at Vancouver with 351 Sikhs and 21 Panjabi Muhammadans on board. The local authorities refused to allow landing except in a very few cases, as the immigrants had not complied with the requirements of the law. Protests were made, and, while negoiations were proceeding, a balance of 22,000 dollars still due for the hire of the ship was paid by Vancouver Indians, and the charter was transferred to two prominent malcontents. Revolutionary literature of a violent character was introduced and circulated on board. A body of police was sent to enforce the orders of the Canadian Government that the vessel should leave; but with the assistance of firearms, the poilce were beaten off, and it was only when a Government vessel was requisitioned with armed force that the *Komagata Maru* passengers, who had prevented their Captain from weighing anchor or getting up steam, were brought to terms. On the 23rd of July they started on their return journey with an ample stock of provisions allowed them by the Canadian Government.....

"The *Komagata Maru* arrived at the mouth of the Hooghly on the 27th September 1914 and was moored at Budge-Budge at 11 A.M. on the 29th. There a special train was waiting to convey the passengers free of charge to the Punjab. The Government was acting under the provisions of the recently enacted Ingress into India Ordinance, which empowered it to restrict the liberty of any person entering India after the 5th September 1914, if such action were necessary for the protection of the State. Information had been received regarding the temper and attitude of Gurdit Singh and his followers. It was justified by events. The Sikhs refused to enter the train and tried to march on Calcutta in a body. They were forcibly turned back; and a riot ensued with loss of life on both sides. Many of the Sikhs were

armed with American revolvers. Only 60 passengers in all, including the 17 Muhammadans on board, were got off in the train that evening. Eighteen Sikhs were killed in the riot; many were arrested either then or subsequently; and 29, including Gurdit Singh, disappeared. Of those who were arrested, the majority were allowed to go to their homes in the following January. Thirty-one were interned in jail."[46]

Baba Gurdit Singh published an account of the voyage in the form of a book, which is printed, but the date of publication is not stated. This was supplemented by a memorandum issued later by him. He challenges practically all the contentions of the Government. He says he chartered the vessel in order to fulfil the conditions of immigration in Canada, which it was impossible for any single individual to do. For example, the regulations prescribed that no Asiatic would be allowed to visit Canada unless he has travelled by continuous journey from his native country to Canada on a through ticket, and in those days there was no direct steamship service to Canada from India. To obviate this difficulty a ship was chartered. Gurdit Singh says that he and his party scrupulously complied with every provision of law, and it was simply due to the secret institution or instructions of the Government of India that the passengers were not allowed to land. Gurdit Singh categorically denies that his men had any relation with the Ghadar Party, and alleges that in order to lay the charge of sedition at the door of the passengers, a bundle of Ghadar newspapers was secretly introduced into the ship by the Immigration Department; but as soon as this was discovered, it was brought to the notice of the Immigration Officer and the Captain of the ship. The whole matter was also entered into the "History of the Voyage" which was regularly kept. Similarly Gurdit Singh denies that the passengers were in possession of any arms, or delivered any seditious speeches. He also refutes the allegation of being in collusion with a revolutionary party at Vancouver or having any connection with Germany.

According to Gurdit Singh, the treatment which the passengers received at Budge-Budge was very harsh. They were not given time to settle their affairs, and all their luggages were taken by the Police, to be returned only after they reached the Punjab. The passengers protested that there was no law to

oblige them to go to the Punjab, but were told in reply that it was Government of India's order and must be carried out. They prayed for time and expressed a desire to go to Calcutta, but they were asked immediately to get into the train which would take them to the Punjab. As they failed to do so they were fired upon.

According to Gurdit Singh, what took place at Budge-Budge was not a riot but a cruel massacre, and the casualties were much higher than mentioned in the report. He also alleges that the six men on the Government side who were killed were really shot by the fusiliers and he seeks to prove it by the fact that the passengers had no arms; and the Committee also tacitly admits it when it observes that the rifle shots by which two of them were killed were of the same calibre as used by the fusiliers. Regarding the possession of arms Gurdit Singh has categorically denied the charge and made a number of interesting comments:

Regarding the supply of arms by the Committee at Vancouver he says that "the allegation is entirely false." "The truth is," says he, "that the Vancouver Police prosecuted Balwant Singh and Mewa Singh for unlawful possession of arms. The former was acquitted and the latter was fined Rs. 15 for having in his possession one pistol". As regards the passengers being equipped with a large number of pistols, the Committee itself puts this number sometimes as 40 and sometimes half that number. Gurdit Singh says that the Japanese crew sold some pistols to the passengers, but as soon as he came to know of it he threw them overboard and "served a notice on the Captain to prohibit the crew from doing so". He points out that even Raghbir Singh, a police informer, whom the Committee of Inquiry admits to be the leader of the faction hostile to him (Gurdit Singh), deposed in a case at Lahore, in 1917, to the effect that "the ship had one pistol and one sword, the latter belonging to me." Further, Gurdit Singh pointed out that as the passengers were thoroughly searched several times and their luggage was taken away by the Police, the passengers, when they landed at Budge-Budge could not have any arms with them. Gurdit Singh makes a very strong case on this point, and once his view is admitted, the whole Government version falls to the ground.

The official version of the *Komagata Maru* incident differs

radically from that of Gurdit Singh on almost every point. As all the relevant documents are not available it is not possible to examine the question critically in order to come to a final decision. But attention may be drawn to a few points of special importance.

1. The official version is based upon the report of the Committee of Inquiry set up by the Government. This report is admittedly based on *ex parte* evidence, mostly of those very men whose conduct was under scrutiny. The version of the other side was never placed before the Committee and no opportunity was given to the accused either to cross-examine the witnesses or to rebut the evidences. The personnel of the Committee was also such that it could not inspire any cinfidence in its findings.

2. According to Gurdit Singh the passengers were thoroughly searched more than once, and it is difficult to believe that the Police neglected this ordinary precaution. It is therefore incredible that the passengers could have any fire-arms in their possession.

3. Regarding the legal position of the passengers in Canada, one of the most reputed firms of Solicitors, when questioned to take up the case for the passengers, replied : "It seems to us that it is a question for diplomacy rather than law, and we do not feel that we could conscientiously enter upon a legal fight under these circumstances."

4. Before leaving Hong Kong Gurdit Singh consulted three foremost counsels of that place and they gave their opinion in favour of the voyage. This written opinion proves the bonafide of Gurdit Singh and shows the baseless character of the charges brought against him in the official version.

5. The Committee of Inqury admitted that things were not so bad as to require the measures adopted by the Government, but excused the latter on the ground that it is easy to be wise after the event. "It appears to us", so goes the report, "that the Government decided to adopt the measures actually taken, partly owing to lack of information, and more particularly from a misapprehension as to the real position of affairs on the ship"

6. There is no doubt that the Government was haunted by the Ghadar-phobia and had preconceived notion about the connection of the passengers of the *Komagata Maru* with that

movement. Partly out of nervous fear, and partly due to inadequate information, they took measures to frustrate the object of the Sikhs to settle at Canada, and later took unnecessary coercive measures ending in a veritable tragedy.

From such evidences as are now available to us it would not be unreasonable to conclude that the much maligned Gurdit Singh was really a benefactor of his community and lost his all in an attempt to serve it by a high-spirited public act. Perhaps when all the facts are known, the Budge-Budge massacre would be placed in the same category as that at Jallianwala Bagh.

VI. GENERAL REVIEW

Before concluding this chapter on revolutionary activities, it is necessary to make a few general observations. It is a well-known fact that there is a considerable volume of opinion against the terrorist methods—political dacoities and murder of officials—as well as against armed resistance or revolution. The objections against terrorism are based on moral consideration while both terrorism and revolution were condemned as useless inasmuch as they were not likely to prove successful in driving away the British or achieving Indian independence.

These are weighty arguments. But in bare justice to the revolutionaries we must refer to the other side of the question also.

In Western countries political assassinations are not always condemned by even thoughtful and respectable people. Their prepetrators, if successful, are regarded as heroes ; and, if caught and executed, are looked upon as martyrs. They are not branded as murderers. This is evident from what Matthew Arnold says in one of his poems from which we extract the following lines :-

"Murder—but what is murder ? When a wretch
For private gain or hatred takes a life,
We call it murder, crush him, brand his name.
But when, for some great public cause an arm
Is, without love or hate, austerely raised
Against a power exempt from common checks,
Dangerous to all, to be thus annull'd—

Ranks any man with murder such an act ?
With grievous deeds, perhaps ; with murder, not."[47]

Even Anglo-Indian journals have sometimes argued in justification of political assassination. For instance, when, in 1906, certain persons were assassinated in the villa of M. Stolypin, the Russian Premier, the *Pioneer* wrote in its issue of 29th August, 1906 :-

"The horror of such crimes is too great for words, and yet it has to be acknowledged, almost, that they are the only method of fighting left to a people who are at war with despotic rulers able to command great military forces against which it is impossible for the unarmed populace to make a stand. When the Czar dissolved the Duma he destroyed all hope of reform being gained without violence. Against bombs his armies are powerless, and for that reason he cannot rule, as his forefathers did, by the sword. It becomes impossible for even the stoutest-hearted men to govern fairly or strongly when every moment of their lives is spent in terror of a revolting death, and they grow into craven shirkers, or sustain themselves by a frenzy of retaliation which increases the conflagration they are striving to check. Such conditions cannot last".[48]

No Indian terrorist could improve upon these words in justifying his policy and action.

But there is a tendency among Englishmen to draw a line between European and Indian terrorists, to the detriment of the latter. Even Annie Besant is reported to have said as follows to a representative of a London Daily :-

"Arabindo Ghose, who has just been acquitted, is a man of the type of Mazzini, with the difference that he is fanatical, which Mazzini was not. He has been the heart of the anti-English movement. He is a man of perfectly pure motives and entirely unselfish. He has no personal axe to grind. But he is dangerous, because he would use any method which would upset British rule."[49]

Unfortunately for Mrs. Besant, historians take a very different view regarding Mazzini. Thus a modern historian, after referring to the foundation by him of a league under the name of "Young Italy", with the object of creating an Italian republic, comments : "Animated by a faith which amounted to fanaticism

he took as his watchword 'God and the People'. He did not shrink from employing all the weapons of conspiracy including even assassination."[50]

In the oath which Mazzini administered to the members of his secret league they vowed "by the blush which reddens my face when I stand before the citizens of other countries and convince myself that I possess no civic rights, no country, no national flag ; by the tears of Italian mothers for their sons who have perished on the scaffold, in the dungeon, or in exile ; I swear to devote myself entirely and always to the common object of creating one free, independent and republican Italy by every means within my power." Every word of this oath would find a responsive echo in the heart of an Indian terrorist.

Mrs. Besant's denunciation of Arabinda is still more curious as she herself supported the cult of violence as a political weapon in no uncertain terms. "Violence," said she, "is the recognised way in England of gaining political reforms." "There would be no Home Rule Bill if landlords had not been shot and cattle maimed—no Reform Bill of 1832 without riot and bloodshed. No later Reform Bills if Hyde Park railings had not gone down." She justified suffragette violence, asking, 'to what else have politicians ever yielded ?'[51] In fairness to Mrs. Besant it must be said that later, in 1916, she regarded the anarchist murders in Bengal as not unnatural outcome of the repressive measures of Government.

It has been noted above that the "Young Italy" and 'Carbonari' of Italy inspired the Bengali youths as early as the third quarter of the nineteenth century. Since then Indian revolutionaries imbibed the spirit of the revolutionaries in other European countries, notably Ireland and Russia. Indeed even English writers like Chirol have shown the close analogy between the methods of Bengal terrorists and those of Ireland and Russia.

Referring to the 'extremists', by which he means terrorists, Chirol writes : "They have of all Indians been the most slavish imitators of the West, as represented, at any rate, by the Irish Fenian and the Russian anarchist. Their literature is replete with reference to both. Tilak took his "No-rent" campaign in the Deccan from Ireland, and the Bengalees were taught to believe in the power of the boycott by illustrations taken from

contemporary Irish history. When the informer Naren Gosain was shot dead in Alipur gaol the Nationalists gloried in the deed, which had far excelled that of Patrick O'Donnel, who shot dead James Carey, the approver in the Phoenix Park murders, inasmuch as Gosain had been murdered before he could complete his "treachery", whereas the murder of Carey had been only a tardy "retribution" which could not undo the past. The use of the bomb has become the common property of revolutionists all over the world, but the employment of amateur dacoits, or armed bands of robbers, for replenishing the revolutionary war-chest has been directly taken from the revolutionary movement in Russia a few years ago. The annals of the Italian risorgimento have also been put under contribution, and whilst there is no Indian life of Cavour, Lajpat Rai's life of Mazzini and Vinayak Savarkar's translation of Mazzini's Autobiography are favourite Nationalist text-books of the milder order. European works on various periods of revoultionary history figure almost invariably amongst seizures of a far more compromising character whenever the Indian police raids some centre of Nationalist activity. Hence in the literature of unrest one frequently comes across the strangest juxtaposition of names, Hindu deities, and Cromwell and Washington, and celebrated anarchists all being invoked in the same breath."[52]

It would be idle to deny that all these terrorists—as a matter of fact terrorists all over the world—share common characteristics; they have the same genesis and follow the same method. It would, therefore, be quite unjust to condemn one and applaud the rest. The Anglo-Indian journals were not only guilty of such discrimination, but, while condemning terrorists, lightly spoke of Englishmen murdering Indians without any qualm of conscience. Thus, in the year 1900, the *Pioneer* published in one of its issues what it no doubt considered a very humorous poem, but what every right-thinking man will consider an almost open justification of, or incitement to, the political murder of "Babus" by Englishmen. We quote the last stanza:—

> "And he travelled by train to that Babu Bhagwan.
> And slew him with Handle-Broom wood,
> And lessened the number of Babus by one.
> Don't blame him. He did what he could."[53]

Thus it will be seen that even Anglo-Indian papers approve of or justify the conduct of political assassins or murderers when such crimes are committed by Europeans in India or in the Christian countries of the West; though they cannot be expected to take the same attitude when the scene is India, the assassins are coloured men, and the victims are white men or their protégé.

Some Indians have urged that political terrorism is 'foreign to the genius of our race.' Of course enunciation of such doctrines during the British regime should not be taken at its face value. Save a few extreme radicals, no politician would venture to openly support terrorist activity. But even if we admit that the view is honestly held by many, it is necessary to probe into the question a little further. In the first place, it is not easy to define what is and what is not the genius of a race. One can easily find injunctions in the Hindu Sastras against murder, robbery, etc. But this is equally true of other religious scriptures also. Christianity enjoins upon its follower: "He who smites thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." Does it mean that any kind of violence, including open war and terrorism, is foreign to the genius of Christian nations of Europe? It is true that terrorism is a new importation to this country.[53a] But so is nationalism or patriotism. The Indians have imbibed these, like terrorism, from Europe. If, therefore, we condemn terrorism only on the ground that it is foreign to the genius of our race, we have to condemn equally many of those features of our modern life which have made India what she is today.

So far as moral objections are concerned, we are on more debatable grounds. The terrorists regarded themselves in a state of war against the British, and defended their methods on the ground that, being situated as they were, they had no means of waging war openly. It is only one stage removed from the guerilla warfare which is condoned by civilized society. On purely moral grounds, a terrorist might argue that to kill a few officials or to rob a few houses is not more sinful than destroying thousands by modern arms or bombing cities in a modern warfare. It is merely an age-long convention which tolerates inhuman cruelties in the name of an open war but staggers at one millionth of it if the conduct of military operations do not fulfil

our preconceived notions of what a war should be or of the conditions it must fulfil.

In any case there is nothing to distinguish Indian terrorism from its European counterpart, and those who support the latter have no right to denounce the former. As has been noted above, liberal elements in England have always accorded their support to continental terrorists, while Irish terrorism found sympathy and support in Europe and America. Terrorism, therefore, has met with approval, at least of those who did not suffer from it, as a last resort in winning political freedom in circumstances which also prevailed in India.

It is only fair to add that some distinguished Englishmen also appreciated the patriotism of the Indian terrorists. When on 1 July, 1909, Madanlal Dhingra shot dead Sir Curzon Wyllie, "Lloyd George expressed to Winston Churchill his highest admiration of Dhingra's attitude as a patriot. Churchill shared the same views and quoted with admiration Dhingra's last words[53b] as the finest ever made in the name of patriotism. They compared Dhingra with Plutarch's immortal heroes."[54] The Irish were naturally more appreciative. "Huge placards from Irish papers paid glowing tributes to Dhingra: 'Ireland honours Madanlal Dhingra who was proud to lay down his life for the sake of his country."[55]

Mr. W. S. Blunt "wrote about his interview with Mr. Lyne Stevens, the Doctor Royal friend. Blunt says: 'He talked about the Dhingra assassination, which seems to have at last convinced his Royal friends that there is something wrong about the state of India. People talk about political assassination as defeating its own end, but that is nonsense, it is just the shock needed to convince selfish rulers that selfishness has its limits of imprudence. It is like that other fiction that England never yields to threats. My experience is that when England has her face well slapped she apologises, not before." Blunt further wrote in his Diaries that no Christian martyr ever faced his judges more fearlessly or with greater dignity and remarked that the day of Dhingra's execution would be regarded as one of martyrdom in India for generations."[56]

Eminent Indians also directly or indirectly signified their approval of terrorism as a method of political warfare. Shortly after the Alipur Bomb Case was over, there was an acute contro-

versy as to the attitude of Arabinda Ghose tewards terrorist method. Many sincerely held the view that he had no sympathy, far less connection, with the cult of bomb. But all controversy has now been set at rest by his own confession that he believed in its efficacy, at least up to a certain stage in the development of Indian politics. The part played by Sister Nivedita in the formation of Secret Societies in Bengal leaves no doubt that she did not, perhaps, altogether discard terrorism as a method of political warfare. The question is somewhat debatable as regards Surendra Nath Banerji. It would appear from the statement of Bhupendra Nath Datta, quoted above,[57] that Surendra Nath not only approved of the idea of throwing bomb at Fuller, but even offered to pay a large amount in order to carry out the scheme. But in his autobiographical memoir—*A Nation in Making*—Surendra Nath does not refer to this incident—which is, of course, quite to be expected—but relates his successful effort to dissuade a band of young men who approached him with a scheme to assassinate Fuller.[58] A revolutionary's memoir describes how Acharya P. C. Roy, the renowned chemist and a true patriot of Bengal, sympathised with the cult of bomb. He secretly met Pulin Bihari Das, the leader of Dacca Anusilan Samiti, mentioned above, and agreed to take charge of preparing explosives with the help of some trusted pupils.[59]

Even the high-souled devotee Aswini Kumar Datta of Barisal approved of terrorism, at least as a means of awakening the country from age-long torpor or slumber.[60] Lala Lajpat Rai said in one of his public speeches: "Young men, your blood is hot. The tree of the nation calls for the blood. It is watered with blood."

In Maharastra, there seems to have been a large measure of public sympathy and support for terrorism. Shri Krishnaji Gopal Khare, a revolutionary leader of Savarkar's time, says in his autobiographical memoir that the arrest of Lajpat Rai in 1907 and other acts of repression made him and some of his fellow-students think that repression ought to be countered by acts of violence in return. But, being doubtful whether it was in the ultimate national interest to do so, he along with two friends went to Tilak and placed their doubts before him. There was a discussion for about three hours. Khare says :

"Although he (Tilak) regarded open agitation for the awakening of the people as the main course to follow, acts of violence at intervals, by way of reprisal, also contributed, according to him, to the maintenance of the spirit of the people."

Several revolutionaries have recorded that the Secret Societies of which they were members were in close touch with Tilak and had the greatest respect for him. Tilak is said to have taken to task some Bengalis for not having the courage to break the heads of Fuller and other officials who were terrorising the people.[61]

Whatever we may think of all this, Tilak perhaps gave the most lucid exposition of the "Cult of Bomb" as a weapon in political struggle. Tilak held the view "that the appearance of bomb in India had changed the outlook of Indian politics", (282) and he appealed to the Government through the columns of his paper, *Kesari*, again and again, "to understand the implications of the new development, and act wisely (282)." The following passages quoted from his writings would convey a fair idea of what he meant :[61a]

1. Shortly after the first Bomb outrage at Muzaffarpur (above, p. 259) he wrote: "The terrible murders that took place in Ireland spontaneously rivetted England's attention to the grievances of that country and then Home Rule or Swarajya for Ireland began to be discussed. Such usefulness, of one sort, of these murders has been indirectly described by Lord Morley in one place. Will the terrible occurrence at Muzaffarpur rivet Lord Morley's attention to the grievances about the partition of Bengal.?" (p. 282).

2. When an Englishman, Mr. Rees M.P., advised the Government to carry repression of the revolutionaries to the utmost, to 'crush down the heads of all in one and the same fashion', Tilak commented :" If Government leave all bounds, as suggested by Mr. Rees, then the consequence thereof shall never be beneficial to Government and to India. Even bombs can be prepared with a little knowledge, at a small cost and with small effort." (p. 282).

3. The following is taken from the leading article in the *Kesari* dated 12 May, 1908, for which Tilak was prosecuted under the Newspaper Act. "It is further evident that the same cir-

cumstances that have given birth to the anarchist cult in Russia have come into existence in this country, and are producing the same result...We, along with other newspapers, have frankly told Government that if they resorted to Russian methods of repression, Indians too shall have to imitate the Russian revolutionaries in their defence (285).

"We, on our part, do not think that our duty ends with condemning the Muzaffarpur outrage. We regret the occurrence, but we are of opinion that so long as the causes which gave rise to it are allowed to remain, it will be impossible to prevent its repetition. It lies entirely in the hands of the Government to prevent the growth of nihilism in Inida. Reform in the administration is the only way to kill this new Upas tree." (286)

4. The following passages are taken from the article published on 9 June, 1908, for which Tilak was prosecuted under Sections 124-A and 153-A of the Indian Penal Code (i.e. sedition), and sentenced to six years' rigorous imprisonment :

"The Bengal bomb-thrower has got more in common with the Portuguese patriots, who assassinated Don Carlos for suppressing their Parliament, and with the hot-headed Russians who committed bomb outrages in desperation owing to the Tsar's refusal to convene the Duma, than with anarchists pure and simple. The bomb in Portugal compelled the abandonment of the policy of repression in that country, while the mighty Tsar had to eat the humble pie before the same engine of destruction. The cessation of the bomb outrages in the two aforesaid countries can never be ascribed to repressive measures, That consummation was due to the fact that the statesmen of both the countries recognised in the bomb new, rising aspirations of the people and made efforts to gratify these aspirations. (290).

"The bomb, however, has put a potent weapon into the hands of the people, and has lessened the respect for the military prestige of the Government. England will not henceforward be able to carry on the administration of the country in a smooth manner unless Englishmen deign to take the people more into their confidence. Manufacture and possession of arms can be prevented by law and police supervision, but the same cannot be said of the bomb. It resembles more a magi-

cal charm than a visible object manufactured in a factory. The bomb prepared by hot-headed madcaps, bent on violence, does not require large quantities of materials for their manufacture, as shown by the bomb factory unearthed in Calcutta." (291)

"It appears that Government have failed to learn a lesson from the discovery..:...."The manufacture of the bomb has become such an easy matter that the police can be easily evaded.

"The grant of the important rights of Swarajya is the only means to get rid of the bomb in India." (p. 291).

Bipin Chandra Pal regarded terrorism as 'not unnatural outcome of the repressive measures of the Government.' He excused the terrorists as youthful idealists and suggested that the only remedy was the grant of Home Rule for India. On the whole, it is permissible to hold that even Indian politicians of moderate type had a soft corner in their hearts for the terrorists.

The prince of poets, Rabinda Nath, may be said to have placed his poetic genius at the disposal of the terrorists. As noted above,[62] some of his finest poems could only be interpreted as an admiring appreciation of the selfless and fearless terrorist revolutionary. In any case, we have the confession of terrorists themselves that they found encouragement in, and drew inspiration from, these soul-stirring poems of Rabindra Nath. More than one of them, now grown old, told the author of this book how, when hunted by the police from one place to another, in hills and jungles, and deprived of any company, they found their only solace in singing by brookside, in evenings or dark nights, those songs or poems which urged them to move forward, even if every one deserted them, amid thunder and lightning, with a heart made of steel and an adamant resolve.

Bold journalists were not wanting who made no secret of their sympathy and support for terrorist methods. This does not refer to the organs of terrorism like the *Yuganatr*, but ordinary journals not associated with any secret society.

Nobody can doubt that there was a deep and widely felt sympathy for terrorists among the people at large. One need only refer to the funeral procession for carrying the dead body of Kanai Lal Datta, who murdered the approver Naren Gossain, within the compounds of Alipur Jail. Thousands of men, wo-

men and children walked barefooted along the streets of Kalighat to the burning ground at Keoratala, while the ladies from balconies of houses blew conch-shells and dropped auspicious objects on the dead body. There were loud sobbings when fire was set to the pyre, and many observed fast throughout the day. It was a touching scene, impossible to forget.[62a]

Another manifestation of popular sympathy is to be found in pouplar folk songs about the martyrs like Khudiram, Prafulla Chaki[62b] and others, which were openly sung in towns and villages all over Bengal. Even an additional verse in honour of these heroes was added to a famous song ("my native land") by D. L. Roy in which he sang the past glories of Bengal and her great sons.

It is not necessary to go into further details. Enough has been said to indicate that the terrorist movement in Bengal was not the work of a few misguided youths nor the fleeting fancy for a moment. It was a great political movement, based upon European models, and its roots were laid very deep in the country.

We may now consider in some detail the two chief manifestations of terrorism, namely murder and dacoity. So far as evidence goes, there is no reason to doubt that the terrorists sought to murder only Government officials or persons who helped them against the revolutionaries. The vast majority of the former belonged to the Police Department whose business was to trace the revolutionary oragnizations and bring their members to book. The wrath of the terrorists fell in particular on those officials whose special abilities were a constant menace to them, such as Basanta Kumar Chatterji, or who were instrumental in apprehending the revolutionaries, such as Nandalal Banerji who went out of his way in tracking Prafulla Chaki to death. In a few cases, like that of Kingsford, particularly vindictive attitude of a Judge towards the members of the terrorist groups marked him out for capital punishment. In some cases, again, the terrorists removed from their way men who knew a great deal of, or was in a position to communicate, vital secrets. Illustrations are afforded by Ashutosh Biswas and Shamsul Alam, connected with the Manicktolla Bomb Case. The non-officials selected for murder fell chiefly into two classes,

viz. (1) those who secretly supplied information to the Police or gave evidence in their favour in open court; and (2) members of the terrorist organization who betrayed their fellow-members. The terrorists seem to have been more vindictive against them than even against the officials. Cases are on record where vengeance was taken on police informers even after the lapse of more than five years. The terrorists, not unnaturally, argued that after all whatever the officials did was part of their public duties, but it was none of the others' business to betray the revolutionaries who worked for their country,—and these people were merely led by greed and lucre to do the nefarious deeds. It is also a strange coincidence that among the officials the terrorists were mostly successful against Indians and very rarely against Europeans. Some of the terrorists believed that this was a divine dispensation inasmuch as the Englishmen merely tried to serve their own country whereas the Indians were traitors to theirs. But this argument or superstitious belief did not deter them from making attempts on Europeans.

On the whole, the victims of murderous outrage were selected by the terrorists mainly on two broad principles—safety and security for their organization and vengeance for crimes perpetrated against it. There are no reasonable grounds to hold that baser considerations such as personal grudge or party jealousy played any part in the regular programme of murder. There might be isolated or individual cases of this type, but of this we have no realiable evidence.

There was a special department, called Violence Department, in the different terrorist groups for organizing the murders. No plot or attempt to murder was permissible save by the express order of the leaders. They selected suitable men for the purpose and furnished them with necessary weapons, plans and instructions; but as a general rule they themselves did not take any part in the actual commission of the crime, for the organization would be more crippled by their arrest or death than by the loss of ordinary members. In some cases particularly where escape was considered well-nigh impossible, the terrorists carried poison with them in order to avoid identification or torture by the police for confession. In one recorded case the terrorist took potassium cyanide immediately after he shot at his victim.

It is somewhat singular that most of the murders were committed in broad daylight and in the most crowded localities. Yet the terrorists almost always succeeded in effecting their escape. This was no doubt partly due to the fright of the unarmed populace, but also partly to the general public sympathy towards the terrorists. For although even a large crowd might not seize an armed terrorist, he could not evade pursuit or attention from a vigilant crowd, eager to see him arrested. Yet in not a single case did the Police obtain any assistance from the passers-by in tracing the tracks of the assassin. Fear of the Police was another element that entered into the calculation of the crowd. To avoid unnecessary harassment at the hands of the police—which was the usual experience of Indian citizens in such cases—the people who witnessed any such event dispersed as quickly as they could and as far as their legs could carry them. Even the shop-keepers or others who failed to take such a course feigned complete ignorance—they were too puzzled to notice anything. More than one terrorist who took part in such outrages has asserted that within a few seconds after the shots were fired in a crowded tramcar, it was empty, and the first to run away were the bodyguards of the victim, handsomely paid by the Government to protect him from his would-be assassins.

The political dacoities stood on a different footing from the murders. Here the victims were almost invariably Indians—mostly people who had done no wrong to the revolutionary groups. For though, as noetd above, Government money was looted in a few cases, it was mostly peaceful men, unconcerned with politics, and innocent villagers who came to their aid, that suffered in the hands of the terrorists. Besides these moral considerations, the dacoities were sure to alienate the people from the revolutionaries. For these reasons even a large section of the terrorists was adverse to dacoities.

The object of these dacoities, as noted above, was to secure the money essential for carrying on revolutionary activities. It was found impossible to collect necessary money by raising subscriptions. At the beginning some rich men contributed to the revolutionary fund, but the confession of Narendra Gossain in the Manicktalla Bomb Case, which implicated a number of such persons, dried up this source by scaring them away. In order

to avoid dacoities attempts were made to manufacture forged notes, counterfeit coins and even prepare chemical gold. But all these attempts proved a failure, though some forged notes were in circulation before the Police discovered the organization.

The matter was seriously discussed in a meeting held at the house of Subodh Mallik in Calcutta in 1906-7. The meeting was attended by representatives of different districts and presided over by P. Mitra. When the necessity for securing money by dacoity was strongly urged by many, some suggested that it should be confined to Government funds alone. It was, however, pointed out that this course required tremendous resources and organization requiring large funds, and these could only be secured by ordinary dacoities. Arabinda Ghose, who was present in the meeting, expressed the view that no moral guilt attaches to the dacoity committed for the purpose of winning freedom for the country. It was ultimately agreed, and a resolution was passed to the effect, that an accurate account should be kept of the amounts robbed from different persons, with a view to returning them after independence was achieved. This is evidently the genesis of the letter referred to above, which the terrorists wrote to the owner of the house in Gopinath Roy Lane in Calcutta, after robbing him of Rs. 12,500. It was also suggested that only those who have amassed wealth by dishonest means or are public malefactors should be victimised. But it is difficult to believe that this principle was always followed in practice.

After the arrest of Pulin Das and declaration of Anusilan Samiti of Dacca as an illegal association, its members fled to Calcutta and suffered great privations, even to the extent of going without food. They approached the Calcutta Anusilan Samiti whose leaders, P. Mitra and Satis Bose, were both opposed to dacoities. But when the terrorists described their plight to P. Mitra and told him that they had nothing to eat that day, P. Mitra permitted them to commit one dacoity.

As a matter of fact, the terrorists were driven to dacoity out of sheer necessity. They rightly pointed out that to give up dacoity would be tantamount to giving up underground revolutionary activities altogether, and instances are not wanting to prove the truth of this assertion.

But although the principal justification of political dacoity lay in its supreme necessity for purposes of carrying on revolutionary activities, moral arguments were added to strengthen the case. We have an interesting account of the process by which members, extremely averse to dacoity at the beginning of their career as revolutionaries, were ultimately converted to this course. Such a member was taught that it was not done for his own benefit, and therefore no sin attaches to him. It was suggested to him that the reason why he was averse to dacoity was the fear of public odium attached to it—that there still lurked in his breast the false idea of the scandal that his association with dacoity would bring upon him. But unless a man can give up everything for his country—even the fear of bad name—and work without any desire for his own benefit, indifferent to praise or blame, he cannot be regarded as an ideal worker. Besides, even supposing that dacoity involved a sin, should not a real patriot be prepared to suffer even the tortures of hell for the sake of his country? To crown all, instances were held out before him of men of the highest ideal and noblest character, like Arabinda Ghose, who found no evil in political dacoity, and of many other high-souled individual leaders who took part in dacoities but whose purity of soul nobody could doubt for a moment. This argument went home and gained many adherents to the terrorist group.

Toe *modus operandi* of these political dacoities have been described by several persons who took part in them. After preliminary explorations an elaborate plan containing the minutest details in respect of the function of each individual was prepared in each case and thoroughly discussed. After it received the sanction of the leader of the Department the personnel were selected and given necessary instructions. Particular duties were allotted to each individual and strict military discipline was enforced. Some were to mount guards at respective posts, some to keep the inmates in check, some to break the iron chest, and, above all, each was to obey implicitly the orders of the leaders for which elaborate signals were devised. In one case the iron chest was broken open and a large amount of money was found. But at that moment the pistol of a revolutionary was accidentally discharged and seriously wounded a member of the

party. The leader found that he had to choose between carrying the money or the wounded comrade. The latter said in a firm tone : "Do not hesitate, carry the money which will place us above want for a long time, together with my head severed from the body in order to avoid detection of my identity." But in spite of his repeated requests to this effect, the leader sounded his bugle for retreat. The money was left behind and the wounded comrade was carried instead on their shoulders. The authenticity of this incident is beyond dispute, as some of the actors and the medical man who secretly treated the wounded were well-known persons.

Unlike the political murders, the political dacoities did not always receive much public sympathy and support. In many cases the dacoits were opposed not only by the inmates of the house but even by the public. The detailed account of the Barha dacoity, given above, [63] which illustrates the courage, resourcefulness, and strict military discipline of the terrorists, may also be cited as an evidence in this respect. There a large crowd of villagers doggedly pursued the dacoits for hours in spite of the fact that the latter fired at them a large number of rounds. It is true that while the terrorists shouted "*Bande Mataram*", some of the pursuers, realizing their real nature, responded with the same cry, and retired, but still a large number did not give up the chase. According to one account these were mostly Muslims. But this cannot be verified. In other cases, too, we have evidence to the effect that a free fight took place between the villagers and the dacoits, whose real nature as political terrorists could not but be suspected by them. Incidentally, this fact, offering such a striking contrast to the immunity with which terrorists effected their escape after murdering officials, is full of significance. It proves that the political dacoits did not enjoy the same amount of public sympathy and support as the political murderers.

Although while committing dacoities, the terrorists did not shrink from inflicting even mortal wounds, they observed a sort of moral code. They did not, for example, torture anybody and did not use any physical force unless they were opposed. In particular, it was strictly forbidden to lay hands on any woman. In one case a terrorist, while attempting to snatch a

necklace from a lady, was struck by one of his comrades, who even threatened to kill him. He was henceforth regarded as an unworthy member and strict vigilance was kept upon him. It was strictly enjoined that no one should seek any private gain from these dacoities, and all the looted money must go to common fund. As a matter of form, after every dacoity the body of every person who took part in it was rigorously searched.

These were, of course, the ideals, and instances are on record to prove that many terrorists, at least during the early years, gave evidence of a high moral purpose, absence of greed, great endurance, strict sense of discipline and fearlessness, even of death. But human nature being as it is, one could hardly expect that all could reach this high ideal, or maintain it for a long time. In the course of time there was a great degeneration, as is admitted by the terrorists themselves. Dacoities were committed out of greed or for personal ends, and political object was used as a mere cloak or disguise. But such cases were not many and mostly occurred during the later periods.

Finally, we come to the third method of the terrorists, viz., preparations for an armed rebellion. It was not liable to any moral opposition, but, along with the two others, it was opposed on practical grounds. It was argued that the terrorist method of manufacturing bombs, or of killing officials would not paralyse the Government of India, and an armed rebellion against the powerful British Raj, with the unlimited resources of a world-wide Empire, is nothing short of madness.

In order to discuss this question we must first take into account the genesis of terrorism, just to show that it was a product of deep-rooted causes, and not a mere fanciful freak of a few misguided youths, or, as some would even say, of fanatic or unbalanced minds. The autobiographical memoirs of several revolutionaries have revealed the fact that they took to the path of violence on account of repressive measures of the Government against which they found no other remedy. The arrest of Lajpat Rai, the incarceration of Tilak, the sentence passed on Savarkar brothers, etc. have been cited as immediate causes for the change of mind in favour of terrorism. The following statement of Dhingra (said to have been prepared by

Savarkar) who murdered Curzon Wyllie in London gives us a true insight into the mentality of a terrorist :

"I admit, the other day, I attempted to shed English blood as an humble revenge for the inhuman hangings and deportations of patriotic Indian youths.....I believe that a nation held in bondage with the help of foreign bayonets is in a perpetual state of war. Since open battle is rendered impossible to a disarmed race, I attacked by surprise ; since guns were denied to me, I drew forth my pistol and fired." The statement proceeds : "As a Hindu, I feel that a wrong done to my country is an insult to God." It concluded : "The war of independence will continue between India and England so long as the English and Hindu races last (if this present unnatural relation does not cease)."[64]

We may quote the contemporary view of one opposed to terrorism which reflects the opinion of a large section of thinking public of those days.

"The Genesis of Terrorism in Bengal."

"The Calcutta bomb-makers have presented Viscount Morley with an unquestionably new fact, which he wanted for the re-consideration of the Bengal Partition question, though even such a fact will not, we are sure, unsettle his "settled fact". Our most radical Secretary of State must get the credit of having produced he bomb-thrower,—a unique performance. The ultimate cause of terrorism in Bengal must be sought in utterly selfish, high-handed and tyrannical policy of the Government, and in the contemptuous and insulting manner in which most official and non-official Anglo-Indians have spoken of and treated Bengalis. They have ridden roughshod over the feelings of the Bengalis and turned a deaf ear to their strongest and most reasonable representations, supported by facts and figures. The Russianization of the administration in spirit and methods has led to the conversion of a small section of the people to the methods of Russian Terrorism. It is simply a question of action and reaction, "stimulus" and "response". Persistently unrighteous administration has an inevitable tendency to make men seek desperate remedies. Finding no remedy in constitutional agitation, burning to wreak what they considered "national vengeance," impatient and eager to wipe off the cowardly

libel that Bengalis are cowards, some desperate young men have had recourse to desperate and unrighteous methods."[65]

As to the effectiveness of the terrorist methods, the different terrorist groups had different views, and we must try to understand them before indulging in any criticism.

To those who argued in 1908 that a few bombs would not drive away the British, we can do no better than quote the very effective reply given by Barin Ghose himself, the leader of those who manufactured the first bombs in Bengal. "Your sermons lost labour. We did not mean or expect to liberate our country by killing a few Englishmen. We wanted to show people how to dare and die."

Few would deny that this object was more than fulfilled. The discovery of activities of Manicktolla group of revolutionaries led by Barin Ghose gave an impetus to the latent revolutionary mentality of the Indians such as nothing else could. It gave rise to that fearless spirit of defiance and resistance against the fancied dread of British power and prestige which has formed the foundation of all subsequent revolutionary activities.

Some distinguished Europeans and Indians not only held a similar view, but also believed that terrorism was an effective weapon for forcing an unwilling Government to grant concessions. This would appear from the statements quoted above, particularly those of Mrs. Besant, Blunt and Aswini Kumar Datta.[66]

But when terrorist activities were widely spread and put on an organized basis through Anusilan Samiti and other associations of this kind, a section of the terrorists really believed that by sufficiently extending their activities they could paralyze the British Government or at least make their position so embarrassing and perilous as to force them to make substantial concessions to our political demands. The passage, quoted above[67] from the *Pioneer* of 29th August, 1906, may be cited in support of the views of the terrorists.

As a matter of fact a section of the terrorists honestly believed that their activities had already demoralised the police and the Government officials to a great extent, and if they could widen the scope of their activities and carry them on for a sufficiently long time as a well-concerted measure, conspicu-

ous success would follow. Even, as it was, they claimed that the Reforms of 1909 and 1919 were due more to the fear of the terrorists than to the constitutional agitation of the Congress. This view was shared by a large section of the public, unconnected with, or hostile to, terrorism, and even by some Englishmen.

As regards armed rebellion it was quite clear to the terrorists from the outset that its success depended upon two important factors, viz., (1) the international situation involving the British in a deadly war with a great European power; and (2) the help of the Indian soldiers. Their own share was merely to keep the country ready to take advantage of any such favourable emergency. They learnt the great lesson from the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857, that there was no hope of success unless the mutiny of soldiers was backed up by a wide-spread revolutionary organization among the civil population, and also felt that it was necessary to obtain material help, in the shape of armaments and equipment, from a great European power. The outbreak of the Great War in 1914 shows that the revolutionaries in India were not wrong in their anticipations. But unfortunately the war broke out too early, before their plans were in full operation. In any case, judged from their point of view, their policy and actions cannot be pronounced unpractical or chimerical.

A distinguished writer has observed:

"It may not be a matter for surprise that German intriguers succeeded in persuading some uneducated or half-educated Indians in America to believe that an armed revolution was feasible and desirable in India, but that persons like some of the conspirators (in the San Francisco trial), who had graduated in Indian or foreign universities or had received some education in other ways and could therefore be presumed to know the present circumstances of India and what modern warfare meant, should believe it possible and desirable, is rather surprising."[68]

These lines were written immediately after the trial at San Francisco, when the Press was fettered in every way in India. Hence they may or may not be taken at their face value, for it is idle to expect any free or frank expression of views on such

matters at that time. But in any case a few reflections are permissible. In the first place, we must distinguish between "feasible" and "desirable". It would be difficult to blame any section of Indians if they think that an armed revolution is 'desirable' if it offers a reasonable chance of freeing India from a foreign yoke. The Irish revolutionaries not only thought it desirable but also feasible, though their chance of success must have been smaller than that in the case of India. Netaji Subhas Bose also thought in the same line at a later date.

As regards feasibility of the plan, the 'conspirators' thought of armed revolution as merely a part of the whole programme, including the mutiny of the sepoys. They also counted upon the possibility that very few British soldiers would remain in India, as was actually the case on some occasions, as noted above.[69] Opinions are bound to differ in this matter, but no one need feel 'surprised' that a body of educated men could think and act in this way.

Lastly, it is only fair to remember that the Indians were not persuaded by the Germans. The truth lies the other way, for it was the Indians who persuaded the Germans to help them. To regard the Indian conspirators as the dupes of Germans or to represent them as mere "cat's-paws" of the Germans, is against all evidence. Looked at in this light, it is also worth consideration whether the German Government would have spent an enormous amount of money for the project if they were convinced that the project had absolutely no chance of success. They certainly thought that with the arms and money provided by them it would be possible to foment some sort of insurrection in India which would force the British to keep a larger army in India and otherwise also to divert their resources and energy from the European battlefields. The Germans probably had no desire or definite aim to liberate India, but the Indian revolutionaries utilized their war strategy to serve their own ends. It would be therefore more appropriate to regard the Germans as dupes or 'cat's paws' of Indian revolutionaries.

Footnotes to Chapter VIII

The following abbreviations have been used. Bose = A.C. Bose, Indian Revolutionaries Abroad. Guha = Arun Guha, First Spark of Revolution. Uma Mukherjee = Two Great Indian Revolutionaries.

1. Bose, pp. 27-8.
2. Above, pp. 298 ff.
3. Bose, pp. 32-3.
4. Ibid, p. 28.
5. Ibid, pp. 68-70.
6. Ibid, pp. 72-3.
7. Ibid, pp 73-4.
8. Ibid, p. 75.
9. Ibid, pp. 39-41.
10. Ibid, p. 42.
11. Randhir Singh *The Ghadar Heroes* (Bombay, 1945, pp. 6-7.
12. This is quoted from a thesis entitled 'American Relations with South Asia, 1900-1940,' by E. R. Schmidt of the University of Pennsylvania.
13. Bhupendra Nath Datta, pp. 228-30; cf. also the accounts given by N. N. Bhattacharya in the *Journal of Indian History* (Indian Independences Silver Jubilee Number) pp. 420-21.
14. Randhir Singh, op. cit., 8-9.
15. Har Dayal, *Fourty-four Months in Germany and Turkey*, p. 19.
16. This account of the meeting at Astoria differs somewhat from that given in p. 369 above. But there seems to be little doubt that the Ghadar Party was formed in a meeting, at Astoria, the date of which is given differently as 13 March and 13 June, 1913.
17. This is based on an article, entitled "The Hindu Conspiracy, 1914-17" by Giles T. Brown, published in the *Pacific Historical Review*, Vol. XVII (1948), pp. 299-310).

17a. See pp. 314 ff.

17b. See p. 316.

17c. Abinash Chandra Bhattacharya has described in detail his preliminary negotiations with high German officials and the steps he took along with Birendra Nath Bhattacharya to bring together Indian revolutionaries in Germany, which ultimately led to the formation of this Committee (Cf. his book *Europe Bharatiya Viplaber Sadhana* (in Bengali) pp. 133-60.

18. Birendra Nath Datta, op. cit., Chaps. I-III.
19. Captain Henry Landau, *The Enemy Within* (The inside story of German sabotage in America) (G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1937), p. 29.
20. *Pacific Historical Review*, XVII. 309-10.

21. This section is based on the article of G. T. Brown, refered to above in f. n., 17.
22. See p. 395 (4).
23. Uma Mukherjee, p. 203.
23a. The relevant document is quoted on pp. 395-6.
24. Nos. 1, 4, 5, 20 Ibid.
25. The alleged association of Rabindranath with the Indian revolutionaries in U.S.A. is of so great importance that the author of this book made various inquiries in Bengal, but could not get any corroborative evidence. Chandra K. Chakravarty, when interrogated by him, said that the statement was true, but could not furnish any corroborative evidence. This indirectly proves that Chakravarty was the author of the letter. This is now definitely proved by the fact, recently brought to light, that Rabindranath sent a formal contradiction to this allegation against him. I have fully discussed the whole question in the *Modern Review* (June, 1963, pp. 453-4).
25a. Testimony of Tarak Nath Das (*San Francisco Chronicle*, 19 January, 1918).
26. See p. 400.
27. Landua, op. cit. Further diplomatic Correspondence re Gupta is referred to below.
27a. The above account is based on the following official documents :
    1. Sir Edward Grey Papers, Volume No. 800/56 B. Public Record Office, London.
    2. Military Collection No. 425/1914, India Office Library and Records London.
28. This account is based on *The Turmoil and Tragedy in India*, 1914 *and after*, by G. Macmunn, pp. 106-13.
29. Ibid, p. 121.
30. Mahendra Pratap, *My Life Story of fifty-five years* (Delhi, 1947).
31. For his early career, see p. 374.
32. For his early career, see p. 416.
32a. See pp. 270-280.
32b. See pp. 389 ff.
33. *Sedition Committee Report*, pp. 121-22.
34. Cf. Uma Mukherjee, pp. 197 ff.
35. See footnote 8 of Chapter VI.
35a. According to Arun Guha (p. 392) the unequal fight continued for about 75 minutes till Jyotindra's party ran short of ammunitions.
36. *Sedition Committee Report*, p, 174.
37. Ibid, p. 175.
38. See pp. 406 ff.
39. O'Dwyer, pp. 180-81.

40. Ibid, pp. 181-82.
41. *Sedition Committee Report*, p. 151.
42. Ibid, pp. 152-3.
43. See above, p. 248.
43a. According to K. C. Ghosh the bomb was thrown by Basanta from the street, *Jagaran O Bishphoran* (*in Bengali*), p. 368.
44. See above, p. 285.
44a. See pp. 345-6.
45. *Sedition Committee Report*, p. 157.
46. Ibid, 147-8.
47. *MR*, III. 547.
48. Quoted in *MR*, III. 548.
49. *MR*, VI. 83.
50. Ibid.
51. *MR*, XI. 562.
52. Chirol, Sir Valentine, *India Old and New*, p. 146.
53. *MR*, III. 548.
53a. The principle involved in terrorism, namely, getting rid of political opponents by murder (assassination, poisoning etc.), is, however, as old as Kautilya's *Avthasastra* which lays down elaborate methods of doing the same. The *Mahabharata* is replete with instances of this kind. The great Shivaji was also not above murdering a foe or assassinating an enemy. So far as the Muslim rulers are concerned, they adopted it as a general policy. So, it is difficult to maintain that terrorism is foreign to the genius of the Indian culture. Of course, it was theoretically condemned in India, as in any other civilized country in the world, ancient or modern.
53b. Reference has been made above, p. 304, to the details of the murder committed by Dhingra and his statement. The full statement of Dhingras to which Churchill presuambly refers, has been quoted in p. 451.
54. W. S. Blunt, *My Diaries*, Part II, p. 288; Quoted in*Savarkar*, p. 57.
55. *Savarkar*, 56.
56. Blunt, *Diaries*, II. 276; *Savarkar*, 56-7.
57. See p. 258.
58. *Nation*, 233-4. In this connection Surendranath has made interesting comments on political murder.
59. N. K. Guha, p. 355.
50. Bhupendra Nath Datta, *Bharater Dvitiya Svadhinata Sangram* (in Bengali), pp. 6 ff., 193-4.
61. Ibid, p. 10.
61a. The passages are taken from the book, *Lokamanya tilak, A Biography* by Ram Gopal. The figures within brackets at the end of each passage indicate the number of page.

62. See pp. 151 ff.
62a. See p. 261.
62b. See p. 260.
63. See pp. 273-4.
64. Dhananjay Keer, *Savarkar and His Times*, p. 55. See above, pp. 304, 439.
65. *Modern Review*, III. p. 548.
66. See pp. 435-6, 439, 440.
67. See p. 435.
68. *Modern Review*, XXIII, p. 674.
69. See pp. 323-25.

CHAPTER IX

REPRESSION AND REFORMS.

1. REPRESSIVE MEASURES.

The revolutionary movements, including 'terrorist' outrages, continued throughout the War, as related in the last Chapter. The Government of Lord Hardinge, true to the traditional British policy of repression cum reforms, counterbalanced the annulment of Bengal Partition by the most rigorous measures to suppress the revolutionary movement.

In 1913 the Government passed the Indian Criminal Law Amendment Act which made conspiracy an independent criminal offence, and laid down an elaborate definition of 'conspiracy'. Among the conspiracy cases the most famous was the Delhi Conspiracy Case in 1913. A number of persons were put on trial for planning to murder Lord Hardinge by throwing bomb at him in Delhi in December, 1912, as mentioned above. There were other subsidiary charges such as placing a bomb on a road in the Lawrence Gardens at Lahore on May 17, 1913, which killed no European, as was intended, but an Indian. Four of the accused—Amir Chand, Avadh Behari, Balmukund and Basanta Kumar Biswas—received capital punishments and two others were sentenced to rigorous imprisonment for seven years. The chief conspirator, Rash Bihari Bose, however, managed to escape to Japan.

The Defence of India Act was passed *unanimously* in a *single* sitting of the Imperial Legislative Council on 18 March, 1915. As Hardinge himself admitted, it was far more drastic than the corresponding Legislation DORA (Defence of the Realm Act) in Britain. The depth of degradation to which the Moderate Party had sunk may be gauged from the attitude of the Indian members of the Assembly, all belonging to that Party. This has been revealed in the following passage in Lord Hardinge's autobiography:

"When the Bill was published it provoked a considerable outcry and several Indian members protested to me privately against the stringency of some of its most drastic provisions, and said that they would have to oppose the Bill in the Assembly. I told them that they were free to criticize the Bill in debate and to say whatever they pleased against it when it came up for discussion, and that I quite appreciated their point of view, but that, as responsibility for peace and tranquillity in India rested with me, I nevertheless cinfidently counted upon them to pass the law in the end. When the Bill came up for debate a large number of amendments were proposed, and the Indian members aired their criticisms freely, but in the end it was passed unanimously with two slight amendments that I accepted when I wound up the debate in a carefully considered speech. Those two trifling amendments "saved the faces of the Indian critics."[1] Lord Hardinge has also revealed the mainspring behind this grovelling attitude of the Moderates. We are told that after the bomb outrage on Hardinge at Delhi, Gokhale assured him that he (Gokhale) "would never oppose any measure" that the Viceroy really wished to be carried in the Legislative Assembly.[2]

The Defence of India Act, to which Gokhale and his Moderate Party gave their willing assent, was not simply a war measure like the English DORA. In addition to the measures to protect the military and naval interests of the country, it contained clauses which authorized the Government to supersede the provisions of the Criminal Law and institute summary trials by Special Tribunals, each consisting of three Commissioners appointed by the Local Government. The Act empowered the Tribunal to inflict sentences of death, transportation for life, and imprisonment up to ten years, for violation of rules or orders framed under the Act, and there was no appeal from its decision. The Tribunal was not bound to follow the provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure of 1898. It had to make only a memorandum of the substance of the evidence and was not bound to adjourn any trial, and could accept as evidence the statements of any person, recorded by a Magistrate, even if the person were subsequently dead or otherwise incapable of giving evidence.

The rules, for the violation of which a person was liable to

be tried and punished in such an irregular and extraordinary fashion, were to be made by the Government at its discretion, "for the purpose of securing the public safety and the defence of British India." This was vague but comprehensive, and practically gave a *carte blanche* to the Executive Authority. Among the specific matters covered by the rules, attention may be drawn to three clauses, under which the Government could make rules (i) to empower any civil or military authority where, in the opinion of such authority, there are reasonable grounds for suspecting that any person has acted, is acting, or is about to act in a manner prejudicial to the public safety, to direct that such person shall not enter, reside or remain in any area specified in writing by such authority, or that such person shall reside and remain in any area specified or that he shall conduct himself in such manner or abstain from such acts, or take such order with any property in his possession or under his control as such authority may direct; (ii) to empower any civil or military authority to enter and search any place if such authority has reason to believe that such place is being used for any purpose prejudicial to the public safety or to the defence of British India, and to seize anything found there which he has reson to believe is being used for any such purpose; (iii) to provide for the arrest of persons contravening or reasonably suspected of contravening any rule made under this section and prescribing the duties of public servants and other persons in regard to such arrests. The net effect of these rules was that the Government could authorize any official to do anything in regard to any person and his property, merely 'on *suspicion* that such a person *may act* in a way which in the opinion of the Government was 'prejudicial to the public safety'—a beautifully vague term which may mean anything and everything.

So the Government, established by law in British India, passed a law to the effect that the reign of Law had ceased and India was henceforth to be governed by the fiat of the Executive Authority. The mockery of a judicial trial was merely intended to delude the people into the belief that the reign of law was not altogether a thing of the past.

A number of cases were tried by Special Tribunals set up under the Defence of India Act. Among these were nine conspi-

racy cases, in each of which a large batch of conspirators was tried together. Notorious among these were three different trials for conspiracy in the Punjab known as Lahore Conspiracy trials. The nature of the charges against the accused has been mentioned in the preceding Chapter.[3]

Altogether nine batches, totalling 175 persons, were put on trial for general conspiracies, of whom 136 were convicted of offences which were in nearly all cases punishable with death, as apart from the separate outrages.....38 were sentenced to death (18 later commuted to transportation for life), 58 transported for life, and 58 transported or imprisoned for shorter periods. Some mutinous soldiers were tried by court martial and a large number was dealt with by the ordinary courts on charges of murder, robbery etc. Reference may also be made to the Banaras Conspiracy Case, as a result of which Sachindra Nath Sanyal, mentioned above, was transported for life, and ten were sentenced to various long terms of imprisonment.

In accordance with the first rule, made under the Defence of India Act, mentioned above, a large number of persons was interned, on *mere suspicion,* for an indefinite period in unhealthy localities, sometimes infested with snakes. Their miseries and suffering were so great that some turned mad or committed suicide, and a great many were affected with incurable diseases which led to their premature death.

There was a continuous and vigorous agitation in Bengal against the policy of internment. It was alleged that in not a few cases the cruel treatment of the detenus bordered on inhumanity. Two most shocking cases were often cited as instances. Professor Manindranath Seth, M.Sc., Vice-Principal of the Daulatpur College, was arrested on August 28, 1917, and kept in solitary confinement. He showed symptoms of insanity in September, developed pthisis next November, and died on January 16, 1918. A still more shocking case was that of Professor Jyotish Chandra Ghosh of Hooghly. He was arrested on January 3, 1917, and kept in a solitary cell for two months. He developed symptoms of insanity and gradually sank into a state of coma; totally irresponsive to all sensations, he was artificially fed through nose, and thus lived—dumb, staring, rigid, paralysed into a block. His poor old mother cried and appealed from the

lowest official to the Viceroy, to give back her child to die in her arms, but even this cripple, against whom no crime was proved, was not allowed to come out.[4] These and several cases of alleged suicide were generally believed by the public to be results of inhuman torture and suffering inside the jail or place of confinement. What terrible and inhuman atrocities were perpetrated behind 'the iron curtain' by minions of law and order will never be accurately known, but enough light is thrown upon this type of terrible tragedy by the memoirs and writings of a few of those who were the victims of the lawless law and survived the British regime to tell their tales of woe and suffering in public. Anyone who reads these books will get some idea of the immense depth of infamy to which a civilized people or their Government could descend. Inhuman cruelties and barbarous methods of torture, applied to men kept on *mere suspicion* within the four walls of a dungeon at the *absolute mercy* of the so-called 'guardians of law and order'. recall the barbarities perpetrated in the German concentration camps during the Second World War. Had there been any trial of those guilty of similar crimes in India, as there was in Germany after the War, another chapter of horror and infamy would have been added to the history of man's inhumanity. The treatment meted to the so-called 'terrorists' in India constitutes one of the blackest chapters in the hisory of the British rule in India.

II. GRANT OF REFORMS

1. The Critical Situation

Lord Chelmsford, who succeeded Lord Hardinge as Viceroy in April, 1916, followed the traditional policy of repression cum reforms. The repressive measures, under the Defence of India Act, were pursued in full vigour, and the official terrorism inaugurated by that Act continued in full force throughout the period of War and even after it was over in 1918.

At the same time the authorities, both in India and Britain could not ignore the reality of the tense political situation in India. The game of playing the Muslims against the Hindus and of rallying the Moderates against the Extremists had failed, and

political India was united as never before. The Home Rule Movement had deeply stirred the people, such as was witnessed only in Bengal during the *Swadeshi* movement. The Government had even then found it difficult to cope with the national awakening although it was mostly confined to Bengal. They could easily realize the tremendous nature of the task now before them, involving, as it did, the suppression of national impulses of the people over a wide stretch of territory. The repressive measures were tried, but failed. The whole country was seething with discontent and disaffection, and there was a spirit of open defiance against the Government. The so-called terrorist organization was at work, and extended its activities to foreign lands in order to exploit the situation created by the World War fully to their advantage. To make matters worse, the fortunes of War were steadily going against the British.

The War made the political situation in India worse in other ways also. Reference has been made above to the twofold reaction of India to the War. In the first place, the declaration of War aims by the English and American statesmen made the Indians bold to ask for self-determination in the shape of Home Rule, which the former had promised to every people in the world. Secondly, the Indians wanted to utilize fully the critical situation in England caused by German success, on the famous and well-known principle, England's necessity is India's opportunity

2. Montagu's Historic Declaration

Urged by all these considerations, the British authorities decided to placate the Indians by a further instalment of reform. But it required prolonged correspondence between the Government of India and the Home Government. The former suggested a very modest scheme of reform, merely recommending increase in the number of Indian members in the legislature and greater authority to the local bodies, and hoped that this will rally the Moderates round the Government. Mr. Austen Chamberlain, the Secretary of State, knew better. He wrote:

"After all we must take into account all the changes produced by the War, and the constant emphasis laid upon the fact

that the Allies are fighting for freedom and the nationality, and the Revolution in Russia and the way it has been hailed throughout Europe and America and the effect of all these things on Indian opinion and on our own attitude to Indian questions. What would have seemed to be a great advance a little time ago would now satisfy no one, and we must, I think, be prepared for bold and radical measures."[5]

While this discussion was going on, the Conservative Chamberlain resigned his office as the Secretary of State for India on account of the severe strictures passed upon the Government of India for their bungling in the Mesopotamian Expedition.[5a] Mr. E. S. Montagu, a Liberal statesman, distinguished himself in the debate in the British House of Commons on this question, by his vigorous denunciation of the Government of India, which he described as "too wooden, too anti-diluvian". He also incidentally pointed out that one of the chief arguments against the grant of greater control to the Indians over the administration of their own country, namely, that this would reduce the efficiency of the Government, is no longer tenable, in view of the hopeless inefficiency and mismanagement displayed by the Government in conducting the Mesopotamian Expedition. The appointment of Mr. Montagu as the successor of Chamberlain was, therefore, very significant, and was hailed with delight by the Moderates in India. Montagu prepared a scheme of reforms which was accepted by the British Cabinet after a thorough and minute discussion extending over many days. Strangely enough, this momentous decision was communicated to the House of Commons, on 20th August, 1917, by Mr. Montagu in course of a reply to the question of a private member. Though published in a curiously unpretentious way, the pronouncement is a historical one, and its essential part runs as follows:—

"The policy of His Majesty's Government, with which the Government of India are in complete accord, is that of the increasing association of Indians in every branch of administration, and the gradual development of self-governing institutions with a view to the progressive realisation of Responsible Government in India as an integral part of the British Empire. They have decided that substantial steps should be taken in this direction as soon as possible."

"I would add", proceeded Mr. Montagu's announcement, "that progress in this policy can only be achieved by successive stages. The British Government and the Government of India on whom the responsibility lies for the welfare and the advancement of the Indian people, must be the judges of the time and the measure of each advance and they must be guided by the co-operation received from those on whom new opportunities of service will thus be conferred, and by the extent to which it is found that confidence can be reposed in their sense of responsibility. Ample opportunity will be afforded for public discussion of the proposals which will be submitted in due course to Parliament.[6]

Montagu also announced that he would proceed to India in order to consult the Viceroy and to give a hearing to all the interests concerned in India's advance towards self-government. Other concrete measures also seemed to indicate a new outlook on the part of the British Government. The racial bar which excluded Indians from the King's Commissions in the Army was removed. Mrs. Besant and her associates, kept in detention, were released. In appreciation of this generous gesture the All-India Congress Committee and the Muslim League decided to drop the plan of Passive Resistance.

3. The British Policy Towards India.

It is interesting, and significant, too, that the hostile attitude of the British, both in Britain and India, towards the political aspirations of the Indians did not undergo any change at the beginning of the period under review. Reference has been made above[6a] to the comments of the London *Times* on the resolutions passed by the Congress at its first session in 1885. Though the session was extremely loyal in tone and very very moderate in its demands, the *Times* reminded the Indians that "India was won by force and must be governed by force". Much water had flown by the Ganges since then, but when the Congress met on its bank in Calcutta in 1906, and Dadabhai Naoroji, in his Presidential Address, repeated the political principles of the Moderates in order to arrest the progress of the Nationalist force, the *Times* repeated the old shibboleth: "We have won India by the sword and in the last resort we hold it by the sword".[6b]

The *Englishman*,, the mouthpiece of the Englishmen in India declared: "Dadabhai was brought in to quench the fire but he used only kerosene for the purpose".[6c] The lapse of nearly a quarter of a century had wrought no change in the attitude of John Bull towards India.

Lest it be supposed that the grim War brought about a real change in the attitude of Britain towards India, it is necessary to make a few observations.

Mr. Lloyd George, the Prime Minister of Britain and a member of the Liberal Party, sent greetings to the Government and People of India on behalf of the War Cabinet at the beginnig of 1918. This was evidently a gesture to win the confidence and goodwill of India. But four months before, in a public speech, he had said; "The British Empire was made up of four nations, but today they were one in purpose, action, hope, resolve and sacrifice, and please God, they would soon be one in triumph."[7] India was altogether out of the picture, and this seems to be particularly ungracious when reference is made to the 'sacrifice'. The English public who "cheered" the Premier's statement presumably forgot how the first great onslaught of the Germans in Flanders was stopped by the supreme sacrifice of Indian soldiers[7a] and also the great contributions made by India to the War, advertised to the world by the British themselves to prove the love and allegiance of India to the British rule.

The principle of "*Divide et Impera*" as a means of governing India was as much in favour as ever. Even the Christian missionaries were votaries of this un-Christian doctrine. At the autumn session of the Central Board of Missions of the Church of England held in Manchester on 13 December, 1916, the Dean of Manchester grew eloquent while speaking of "the task which Christianity had before it in the work of the conversion of the great Eastern peoples", and observed that "it had been the policy of statesmen to divide the East and to unite the West. They had realised that the antagonism of the Hindu and the Muhammadan in India tended to lighten the heavy task of administering the Indian empire."[8] The Archbishop of York presided over the meeting and made no protest. Presumably, in the opinion of this worthy representative of the Church of England, the work of English missionaries in India was not only

to convert the Hindus and Muhammadans, but also to set them flying at each other's throat, so that the task of British administrators to keep India under control might be easier.

There was certainly no real change in the attitude of the "official and ruling classes who almost entirely determined Great Britain's Indian policy."[8] They did not directly oppose the idea of granting reforms to India in view of the generous impulses created in Britain in her favour by the heroic sacrifices of Indian soldiers and the rich contributions in men, money and war materials received from that country. But they tried to achieve their purpose in an indirect way. They tried to postpone the introduction of reforms in India on the plea that no great and important changes should be introduced during the War. Lord Ronaldshay, the Governor of Bengal, deprecated all political agitation during the War on the ground that it would produce a great moral effect on the Germans if they knew that the vast people of the British empire had thrown aside all differences and internal disputes until the victory was finally achieved. He also advanced another argument for the same, namely, that the British people resent the idea that anybody "should take advantage of them when their backs are against the wall". It was pointed out by the Indian Nationalists that such considerations did not put a stop to the agitation for the Irish Home Rule Bill which almost theatened a civil war, nor did they prevent the enactment of the British Reform Act of 1918 conceding the demands for enfranchising six million women and two million others—soldiers, sailors etc.—and passing other controversial Bills in the Parliament.[9] The Indian Nationalists did not fail to note that it was the American pressure that induced—practically forced—Britain to grant Home Rule to Ireland. Lloyd George openly admitted it in the House of Commons, but at the same time justified British action on moral grounds. "When large numbers of Irish youths" said he, "were brought into the fighting line, it was right that they should feel that they were not fighting to establish a principle abroad which had not been applied to them." The Indian Nationalists wanted to know "why a vague promise with its fulfilment left to the indefinite future has not been acceptable to, and sufficed for, the Irish, the British women, and the British soldiers and sailors, who were

already in possession of far greater rights of citizenship than ourselves." And also "why President Wilson and the Americans could not be put off with a mere promise."[10] The view of the Nationalists on this point may be summed up as follows:

"Our opinion, then, is that political propaganda should not cease. If Government publish their Reform scheme early, if it be a substantial measure of self-rule, and it be given effect to early, the Home Rule propaganda will cease automatically. But if it be unsatisfactory, we must be allowed to go on with our propaganda. Other nations are fighting for freedom literally. Are we to be prevented from fighting for our freedom metaphorically?"[11]

A more subtle way of postponing all real reforms was devised by a few clever Englishmen who keenly felt the need of placating the Indian politicians at any cost. They adopted the device of holding out before the Indians the alluring ideal and dazzling prospect of 'Responsible Government,' but taking good care not to place any real and effective power in their hands. The movement was initiated by a small body, generally referred to as the Round Table Group, the two most prominent members of which were Mr. Lionel Curtis, originally a Government official in Transvaal (South Africa), and Sir William Duke, who once held the office of the Governor of Bengal. This group formulated a scheme whose basic principle was the introduction of Responsible Government in regard to certain branches of administration only in each Province. In other words, while there would be no change in the powers and functions of the Central Government, there would be practically two Governments in each Province, one of which would be responsible to the popularly elected legislature, and the other continuing as before. It was fondly hoped that while the ideal of 'Responsible Government in India'—never before thought of, far less offered by any British statesman—would win over even the advanced Nationalists, the actual division of administrative subjects between the two sections of each Provincial Government might be made in such a manner as to keep the real power and authority in the hands of the British rulers. This idea, which later became famous as Dyarchy, was first eleborated by Sir William Duke in a scheme for the Province of Bengal. It was discussed by the

Round Table Group, and Duke redrafted it in the light of the discussion. The new draft was printed in May, 1916, and came to be known as the Duke Memorandum. Mr. Curtis, who came to India in October, 1916, made some modifications in this Memorandum, and the scheme, thus finalised, was published in April, 1917.

It is unnecessary to give details of this scheme as it formed the basis of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report, which will be discussed later. It may appear somewhat strange that the Round Table Group promulgated the very important principle of 'Responsible Government' before Montagu made his famous pronouncement on 20 August, 1917, and also worked out the novel scheme of Dyarchy, never thought of before, long before it was recommended in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report. There is, however, no real mystery behind it. The scheme of the Round Table Group was fully known to both Chelmsford and Montagu in or before April, 1917, and was only formally presented to them in November, 1917, in the form of an address signed by sixty-four Europeans and ninety Indians. It was then adversely criticized, sometimes in very scathing terms, by the Hindus, Muslims and Europeans. It seemed to have no friends or patrons in India, but found both in the Viceroy and the Secretary of State. They looked upon it as a godsend for placating the moderate sections of both Indians and Englishmen, and adopted it as the nucleus of their report.

Even after the British Cabinet had made its decision about Indian Reforms, the die-hard section, led by retired British officers serving in India, made a desperate effort to nullify them. Their leader, Lord Sydenham, denounced in the House of Lords Mr. Montagu's famous pronouncement quoted above. The reply made by Lord Curzon on behalf of the Government may be taken as a frank expression of the British policy at its best. In justification of the Cabinet policy he observed :

"It is all very well to say that you ought not to raise these matters in time of war. My lords, it is the war that has raised them. You cannot unchain the forces which are now loosened and at work in every part of the world without having a repercussion which extends over every hemisphere and every ocean; and believe me, the events happening in Russia, in Ireland, in

almost every country in Europe, the speeches being made about little nations and the spirit of nationality have their echo in India iself."

This part of the speech was meant for the consumption of India and the world outside. But Curzon added significant words to allay the fears of Sydenham and his group. "The noble Viscount," said he, "might have been entitled to take the objection he did if there had been in that pronouncement any definite drawing up of a programme, any sketch of what exactly was to be done. It was nothing of the sort. It was a broad general declaration of a general principle, and the lines upon which, in the opinion both of the Government at home, and of the Government of India, our administration of that country ought to proceed in future."

In other words, India must remain satisfied with vague promises which were not considered sufficient for the Irish, British women, and other interested parties. The whole speech is a masterstroke of diplomacy. It holds out high hopes to the Indians by enunciating lofty principles, but at the same time assures Lord Sydenham that he has no cause for anxiety, inasmuch as no definite programme of reform had been drawn up; for after all it is the definite programme which counts. Both sides are 'fed with the hope that when the 'sketch of what exactly was to be done' is outlined, they would find no cause of grievance or complaint. Such a clever trick is bound to fail, and as sequel showed, the scheme satisfied none of the two antagonistic parties. The anticipations of he Indian Nationalists were clearly expressed by the great poet Rabindra Nath Tagore when he observed: "In the case of a gift actuated by motives of expediency, what is given with the one hand is taken away with the other, and such a selfish gift, when examined, will be found to be too full of pores to be kept afloat".[12] These words proved prophetic.

In spite of the announcement of Montagu promising Responsible Government to India the traditional British policy of reforms cum repression was not forgotten by Lord Chelmsford. Even while busy drawing up the Reforms scheme, he appointed a Committee to advise the Government of India whether any legislation was necessary to enable them to deal effectively with the revolutionary movement in India. The object was obvious.

The Defence of India Act would automatically lapse after the end of the War, and it was therefore felt necessary to rearm the Government with similar powers during the post-War period. The Committee, with Mr. Justice Rowlatt of the King's Bench Division of His Majesty's High Court of Justice as President, was appointed on 10 December, 1917, just a month after the arrival of Montagu in India, and it submitted its report on 15th April, 1918, just a week before Montagu and Chelmsford submitted their Report. The Rowlatt Report was published on July 19, 1918, only eleven days after the other. Thus by accident or design the two phases of British policy went hand in hand. The Bill, prepared on the basis of the Report of the Rowlatt Committee, kindled a fire which consumed all hopes of any fair trial of the Reforms proposed by Montagu and Chelmsford. Thus, as in the past, the British policy of repression nullified the effects of the reforms.

4. Reaction to Montagu's Declaration.

Mr. Montagu's historic declaration reacted differently upon the two principal political parties in India. The Moderate party welcomed it as "the Magna Charta of India", while the Nationalists felt that it fell far short of the legitimate expectations of India. The differences were reflected in the next session of the Congress held in Calcutta in December, 1917. To begin with, there was an unseemly quarrel over the election of the President. The Nationalists pressed the claims of Mrs. Besant whose name was recommended by the majority of the Provincial Congress Committees. The final decision lay with the Reception Committee whose members were sharply divided on the issue on strictly party lines. When the question was being discussed, feelings ran high; a large group of Moderate members left the meeting and challenged the view held by the Secretaries that Mrs. Besant was duly elected by the Reception Committee. Ultimately the question was referred to AICC who elected Mrs. Besant by circulation.

The Calcutta sessoin of the Congress was attended by 4,967 delegates and about 5,000 visitors. Mrs. Besant, in her Presidential Address, made a vigorous plea for the establishment of Self-Government in India such as prevailed in the Commonwealth, preferably by 1923, and in any case not later than 1928.

But the specific dates were not insisted upon, and the Congress passed the following resolution

"This Congress expresses its grateful satisfaction over the pronouncement made by His Majesty's Secretary of State for India on hebalf of the Imperial Government that is object is the establishment of Responsible Government in India.

"This Congress strongly urges the necessity for the immediate enactment of a Parliamentary Statute providing for the establishment of Responsible Government in India, the full measure to be attained within a time-limit to be fixed in the Statute itself at an early date

"This Congress is emphatically of opinion that the Congress-League Scheme of Reforms ought to be immediately introduced by Statute as the first step in the progress."

The resolution was of the nature of a compromise The first para was a sop to the Moderates, while the other two reflected the views of the Nationalists.

As could be expected, the die-hards in Britain, aided by the retired members of the Indian Civil Service, fought tooth and nail against the proposed reforms. They also urged upon the Europeans in India to do the same. The successors of those who agitated against the Blact Acts of 1849 and the Ilbert Bill of 1883 hardly needed any such suggestions or encouragement from their brothers beyond the sea. The European Defence Association, which had been started in connection with the opposition to the Ilbert Bill, had gradually shrunk in number and in influence, for they had nothing to fight for or against during the long period of thirty-four years that had elapsed since then. As there was not likely to be any more occasion for 'defence' of European interests in India— the Government of India having faithfully performed that duty—the word 'Defence' was dropped from the name of the Association in 1913. But they must have repented of it four years later when the declaration of Montagu on August 20, 1917, once more threatened their vested interests in India. It acted as an electric shock which galvanized the European Association into feverish activity. In a trice branches sprang up all over India under a new central organization with its headquarters in Calcutta, and the membership which had dwindled down to less

than a thousand suddenly rose to eight times that number. Needless to add that the English-edited papers in India fully backed up the agitation carried on by the Association. They all strongly denounced the proposed reforms, and demanded that in case the 'unwise hasty measure of political advance' was 'thrust on the people of India', the non-official European community must get a separate and adequate representation in the Councils in order to safe-guard their special interests.

The prospect of Responsible Government in India also led to similar demands from certain sections of Indian population, constituting important minorities. The Muslim claims had been settled at Lakhnau Congress. But there were non-Brahmans in Madras and the Sikhs in the Punjab. The non-Brahman Movement had begun in 1916-17 under the capable leadership of Dr. Nair, and it was widely believed at the time that it was engineered by the British as a counterpoise to the Home Rule Movement started by Annie Besant in Madras, as mentioned above. The non-Brahmans, who constituted the vast majority of the people, had just and long-standing grievances against the Brahmans who maintained, for ages, iniquitous social barriers against them, and had practically monopolised knowledge, learning and all power and prestige in the State and society. The non-Brahmans were, generally speaking, materially prosperous, and many of them became wealthy by carrying on trade and commerce. But they strongly resented their markedly inferior status in society, and feared that the Home Rule would mean the perpetuation of Brahman rule. Thus, as in the case of Muslims, the communal spirit was already there, due to historic reasons, and was not a creation of the British, though in both cases the foreign rulers naturally tried to exploit it for creating divisions in he ranks and thereby weakening Hindu political agitators. The non-Brahmans demanded special representation either through separate electorates or through reservation of seats in joint electorates.

The Sikhs who formed only 11 per cent. of the population of the Punjab based their claim for special representation and weightage in the Councils on historical, political and economic grounds. They were the rulers of the Punjab less than seventy years before and had stood by the British in the dark days of

the Mutiny of 1857. Since then they formed an important part of the British army, and one-third of the recruits in the Punjab during the Great War were supplied by them. They formed half the aristocracy and greater part of the landed gentry of the Province, and 40 per cent. of the land revenue and Canal Charges was paid by them. In view of all these the Sikhs claimed one-third of the seats in the Punjab Council.

On the whole, the historic declaration of August 20, 1917, created a stir in political circles, almost unprecedented in the history of British India. In the midst of such tense political situation prevailing both in India and England, Mr. Montagu and other members of his mission arrived in India on November 10, 1917.

5. Montagu-Chelmsford Report

Montagu received a series of deputations from political parties and communal or other groups. Among others, a joint delegation of the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League, and the Home Rule Delegation waited upon him. His visit had the immediate effect of diverting the attention of the Indian leaders from political agitation to various efforts to exert influence upon him. So Montagu had ample justification for writing in his diary on February 28, 1918:

"I have kept India quiet for six months at a critical period of the War; I have set the politicians thinking of nothing else but my mission".[13] In any case it is certainly true that since the historic pronouncement of Montagu on 20 August, 1917, the Home Rule Movement was over-shadowed by the expectations and speculations about the coming reforms. The dullness in political agitation was utilized by Montagu in rallying the Moderate leaders round him with the deliberate purpose of "creating a nucleus of people who will support" his scheme and thus ensure its successful working.[14] As early as December 2, 1917, i.e., almost within a month of his arrival in India, he writes: "A new organization of Indians to be created, assisted in every possible way by the Government, for propaganda on behalf of our proposals, and to send a delegation to England to assist us'. This scheme was discussed and developed in course

of an informal conference with Bhupendra Nath Basu and S. P. Sinha. Under the date, 24 January, 1918, Montagu writes in his diary: "We talked about the formation of a moderate party; they were very enthusiastic; and talked about editing newspapers, and so forth. I think they mean business." Thus it was Montagu who sowed the seeds of National Liberal Federation, a new organization which shortly sprang up, composed of the Moderate leaders who seceded from the Indian National Congress. At the same time Montagu had to whittle down his original scheme in order to appease the Government of India and the British officials. The Report, jointly prepared by Montagu and Chelmsford, was signed by them at Simla on 22 April, 1918.

The most important point in the Report is the enunciation of the goal of Responsible Government for India. None of the schemes for political reforms so far drafted by Indian leaders envisaged the ideal of Responsible Government. As noted above, the idea originally emanated from Sir William Duke, and was taken up by the English Round Table Group, whose leading spirit, Mr. Lionel Curtis, prepared a detailed scheme. This scheme, known popularly us the Dyarchy, was adopted as the basis in the Montagu-Chelmsford Report (henceforth referred to as the Montford Report).

The following specific recommendations were made in the Montford Report, among others :

1. All Local Boards and Municipalities shall contain substantial elected majorities and should have full liberty to impose and alter taxation within the limits laid down by law.

2. The Central and Provincial budgets should be completely separated. Certain subjects of taxation should be reserved for the Provinces and the residuary powers should be kept for the Government of India.

3. The Provincial Executive should be of a composite character : one element consisting of the Governor and an Executive Council of two members, of whom one would, in practice, be an Indian, and the other consisting of one or more Ministers chosen by the Governor from the Legislative Council, and appointed for the lifetime of the Council. The administrative business will be divided into two classes. Subjects trans

ferred to popular control, known as Transferred Subjects, will be dealt with by the Ministers. Other subjects, called Reserved Subjects, would be dealt with by the Governor and Executive Council.

4. Each Province shall have an enlarged legislative council with a substantial majority chosen by direct election on a broad franchise. The Report regards the communal electorate as "opposed to the teachings of history, as perpetuating class distinctions, as stereotyping existing relations, and, in fact, as a very serious hindrance to the development of the self-governing principle. But in order to fulfil the undertaking given to the Muhammadans, the present system of separate electorate should be maintained". As regards other commmunities, the Sikhs in the Punjab are the only minority to whom the Report proposes that the privilege should be freshly conceded.

5. The decisions of the Ministers regarding the Transferred Subjects shall be final, subject to the advice and control of the Governor who is not bound to accept their decisions.

6. If such legislation or such supplies as the Executive Government considers absolutely necessary for the reserved services be not passed by the Legislative Council, it should be referred to a Grand Committee in the Council, so constituted as to enable the Governor to nominate a bare majority upon it.

7. The process of development will be one of adding to the Transferred, and of taking from the Reserved, Subjects, until with the disappearance of the latter the goal of complete responsibility is attained.

8. As regards the Government of India, there should be a second Indian member in the Executive Council and the statutory restrictions governing the appointment of the members of this Council should be abolished. The strength of the Legislative Council, to be known in future as the Legislative Assembly of India, should be raised to about 100 members, of whom two-thirds would be elected and one-third nominated. Of the nominated members not less than one-third shall be non-officials.

9. To secure the affirmative power of legislation the Report recommends the institution of a separate constitutional body, known as the Council of State, upon which the Government should command a majority. Assent by both the Legislative

Assembly and the Council of State should be the normal condition of legislation, but if the Governor-General in Council certifies to the need for special treatment, legislation may be carried in the Council of State alone.

10. The powers of the Parliament through the Secretary of State for India should be considerably curtailed by rules.

11. The Report recommends the institution of a Privy Council for India.

12. As regards the Native States there should be a Council of Princes over which the Viceroy should preside.

13. The Report recommends the recruitment of superior services in India up to a fixed percentage, 33 percent. being fixed for the I.C.S., rising annually by one and half per cent.

It will be seen that the most significant change recommended in the Montford report was in the field of the Provincial Government. While it transferred the administration of certain subjects to popular control care was taken to select for this purpose only those (like education, sanitation, excise which were regarded as 'safe' and 'not vital' to the maintenance of British power and control (such as police, justice, general administration).

6. Reaction to the Montagu-Chelmsford Report.

On the eve of the publication of the Montford Report, the Moderate party led by Surendra Nath Banerji invited a Conference in Calcutta to lend support to it,[15] As could be expected, the publication of the Montford Report on July 8, 1918, was the 'signal of war' between the Moderates and the Extremists. While the Moderates whole-heartedly supported the Report both before and after it was published, the Extremist leaders rejected it *in toto*. "The Montagu scheme" observed Tilak, "is entirely unacceptable". The other leader of the Home Rule Movement, Mrs. Besant, wrote in the *New India* : "The scheme is unworthy to be offered by England or to be accepted by India." Prof. J. L. Banerji expressed the general view of the Extremist party, when he said that "the reforms were grudging, half-hearted, meagre, inadequate, and hence disappointing and abortive."[16]

The Bengal Provincial Conference, in a special session held on July 14, 1918, passed the following resolution, almost un-

animously, only ten voting against it : "That this Conference is of opinion that the scheme of Reforms of the Viceroy and the Secretary of State is disappointing and unsatisfactory and does not present real steps towards responsible government."[17]

But after the first ebullitions had subsided, there seems to have been a general swing in favour of the Report. Ultimately three different schools of opinion emerged which were also reflected in the Indian National Congress. The Moderates regarded the proposals progressive and substantial, though susceptible of a great deal of improvement. The Extreme Left group was of opinion that the proposals were "so radically wrong, alike in principle and detail", that "it is impossible to modify and improve it." There was an intermediate group which looked upon the Report as unsatisfactory, but pleaded for material alteration and not total rejection. The actual difference between this group and the Moderates was not very considerable, except in the language of welcome to the authors of the Report and the emphasis laid upon their sincerity and honesty. For, the suggestoions made by these two schools for the improvement of the scheme envisaged in the Report did not materially differ from each other. As subsequent events showed, this intermediate group in the Congress was much stronger than the Extremist group, and there was no legitimate basis for the fear of the Moderates that the Congress would definitely and summarily reject the Report. But misled by this fear, and due perhaps to other reasons, which are not apparent, the Moderate group in the Congress decided to leave that national organization, and form a separate party. How far Montagu had a hand in this unfortunate split has been mentioned above.[17a]

The Moderate Party never admitted, at least directly, that it was Montagu's influence that led it to secede from the Congress, and gave out that the deciding factor was a firm conviction that there was a real change in the heart of the British Government and that it would be detrimental to the real interests of the country to withhold support from them by offering opposition to the reform proposals. So far, it is not difficult to understand or even to appreciate the Moderate standpoint, even though one may regard the confidence in the British a little too premature. But the real point at issue was whether there were any good

grounds to believe that the Moderates would receive an uncompromising opposition from the Congress and that any association with it would totally destroy the effectiveness of their policy. This was an assumption, pure and simple, without any real basis ; in any case its validity could be easily tested by the Moderates by attending the next Congress Session. If their assumption or apprehension proved to be true, and the Congress decided upon the total rejection of the reform proposals, the Moderates could then leave the Congress and form a separate political organization with greater dignity and, perhaps, with greater support from the public. That they did not choose to follow this obvious and straightforward course lends support to the conclusion that they had given a pledge in advance to Montagu to start a separate orgnization as a price for the grant of reforms.

Howsoever that might be, we must take note of the argument publicly offered by the Moderate party in justification of the momentous decision which practically brought its glorious political career to an ignominious end. This may be best done by quoting the views expressed at a later date by Surendra Nath Banerji, the most outstanding and distinguished leader of the party at the time, as far as possible in his own words[18] :

He pointed out that he did not hesitate to non-co-operate with the Government, and cited as an instance that as a protest against the action of the authorities in Barisal at the time of the Conference in 1906, he resigned his office as Presidency Magistrate of Calcutta and Honorary Magistrate of Barrackpur, being thus "one of the earliest apostles of that cult". But he significantly added, "I altogether repudiate a persistent policy of non-co-operation." Similar were his views about resistance or opposition to the Government. "Opposition to Government," said he, "has been the watchword of my public life...No living Indian politician has been more strenuous, more persistent, in his resistance to the policy and measures of the Government than I have been." "But", he added, "when at last the Government showed signs of an advance to meet the popular demand, and took definite measures towards that end, my opposition gave place to a readiness for co-operation...Recognizing that the Reforms represented a definite advance towards responsible government, to have opposed them would have been a betrayal of our

principles and neglect of our duty to the country. We were, however, under no delusion. We accepted the Reforms for what they were worth. We knew their limitations. But in the existing circumstances it seemed to us that the best thing we could do was to work them, to qualify for more and press for more. Here was an opportunity for peaceful, orderly and progressive realization of responsible government. What alternative was there ? None that we could think of.....A revolutionary movement had indeed been tried in Bengal, backed by men whose selfless devotion to the country could not be called in question ; and it failed. In modern times, revolutionary movements have only been successful with the aid of trained and organized armies. Where is the army to assist the Indian revolutionary ? .....Evolution has been the motto of the Congress since its birth ; and the old leaders of the Congress advocated the progressive realization of self-government, which is the outstanding principle of the message of August 20, 1917....

"The claim of the Moderate party, therefore, is that we are the legitimate successors of the founders and the early builders of the Congress, and that we uphold the ancient traditions of that great institution. It is those who have departed from these traditions that have really introduced violent change, but we remain rooted to our ancient principles, which have brought us in sight of full responsible government and the fruition of the dreams of the early founders of the Congress."

As regards the specific issue of boycotting the Bombay Congress Surendra Nath refers to the "angry outcry from the Extremist organs" after the publication of the Montford Report and observes : "We felt that these hasty and extreme views would dominate the deliberations of the Congress, and that we should not lend them the weight of our support by our presence." He also claims that "the Moderate party saved the scheme", which would otherwise have foundered before the combined opposition against it by the Indian Extremists and the European die-hards. If the Moderates, we are told, "had remained within the Congress fold, they would have been overwhelmed, their voice would have been of a minority of little or no account. The British democracy would have said in view of the practically unanimous

opposition offered to the Scheme : 'Well, if you don't want it, let us drop it altogether".

These arguments do not seem to carry much weight. Opposition by a strong minority within the Congress should have carried far greater weight than the opinion expressed by the same body of men or party assembled in a meeting which possessed no representative character and had no prestige or public support behind it. It is curious to note that in 1907 the Moderates drove away the Extremists from the Congress because of the mischief that could be created by a strong minority, and in 1918 they boycotted the Congress on the ground that a minority view would not carry any weight there. This contradiction in their views and actions can be explained on only one hypothesis, namely that on both the occasions, what they did was only a "command performance", to use the expression applied by the Moderates, among others, to the Muslim Deputation to Minto in 1906. On both the occasions the Moderates were pulled by the strings by two great Liberal Englishmen—Morley in one case and Montagu in the other—whom the Moderates rightly or wrongly believed to have been the saviours of India and of the policy of constitutional agitation followed by them and decried by the Extremists. It was this faith, and neither reason nor logic, that moved the Moderates.

7. Special Session of the Congress at Bombay (August, 1918)

In view of the importance of the Montford Report and the difference of opinion about the Reform scheme envisaged in it, the Indian National Congress very wisely decided to hold a special session in Bombay in August, 1918. In accordance with a resolution of the Moderate Conference held in Calcutta on 17 August, 1918,[19] the Moderate leaders did not attend this Congress, and completed the political split by holding a separate conference of the Moderate party in Bombay in November, 1918.

The special session of the Congress was held in Bombay on 29 August, 1918, under the Presidentship of Hasan Imam. Just a few days before it met, an attempt was made to reconcile the

differences by holding a conference. But the attempt was not successful. Prominent leaders of the Moderate party like Dinshaw Wacha, Surendra Nath Banerji, Bhupendra Nath Basu, Ambica Charan Majumdar and others did not attend the Congress. The session was, however, largely attended, and no less than 3,845 delegates were present. Leaders like Tilak, Mrs. Besant, and Pandit M. Malaviya who attended the Congress regarded the split in the Congress rank as a great catastrophe, and tried to restore the unity by avoiding extreme measures. Due mainly to their influence the Congress adopted a very conciliating attitude. The resolution on the subject passed by the Subjects Committee was very reasonable in tone and wording, and Tilak seems to be fully justified in making the following claim on behalf of the Congress

"We were told the Cogress was going to reject the whole scheme. I could never understand, and have never understood what it means.....Fortunately for all, we have been able to place before you a reasoned document, a resolution, which combines the wisdom of one party, I may say, the temperament of another party, and if you like to call it,—I do not like to call it myself—the rashness of a third party.....We have tried to satisfy all parties concerned and a very difficult task has been accomplished"

After four days' discussion the Congress reaffirmed the principles of reform contained in the Congress-League Scheme and declared that nothing less than 'Self-Government within the Empire' would satisfy the legitimate aspirations of the Indian people. It dealt with the Montagu proposals at great length. It declared that the people of India were fit for Responsible Government and repudiated the assumption to the contrary contained in the Report. It asked for simultaneous advance in the Provincial and the Central Government. It conceded, however, that subject to a Declaration of Fundamental Rights of the people of India, the Government of India should have undivided administrative authority on matters directly concerning peace, tranquillity, and defence of the country. It appreciated the earnest attempt on the part of the Secretary of State and the Viceroy to inagurate a system of Responsible Government, and while it recognized that some of the proposals constituted an

advance in some directions, it was of opinion that the proposals, as a whole, were 'disappointing and unsatisfactory', and went on to suggest modifications which were considered absolutely necessary to constitute a substantial step towards Responsible Government. Dealing with the proposals relating to the Government of India, the Congress desired the same system of reserved and transferred subjects for the Central Government as had been proposed for the Provinces. After the first term of the reformed Assembly, the position of the Viceroy in the Legislative Assembly in regard to transferred subjects should be the same as that obtaining in the Self-governing Dominions. There should be no Council of State, but if one was constituted, at least half of the total strength should be elected. The procedure by certification should be confined to reserved subjects. At least half the members of the Executive Committee (if more than one) in charge of reserved subjects should be Indian. The Legislative Assembly was to consist of 150 members, four-fifths of whom to be elected, and it should have the right to elect its own President and Vice-President and make its own rules of business. A statutory guarantee was demanded that full Responsible Government should be established in the whole of British India within a period not exceeding 15 years.

As regards the Provinces, the Congress resolved that while holding that the country was ripe for full Provincial autonomy, it was yet prepared, with a view to facilitating the passage of the Reforms, to leave the departments of Law, Police and Justice (prisons excepted) in the hands of the Executive Government in all Provinces for a period of six years. Executive and Judicial departments must be separated at once.

As regards communal representation, the Congress resolved that the proportion of Muslims in the Indian and Provincial Legislatures should be as laid down in the Congress-League Scheme. Women should not be disqualified on account of sex.

As regards the place of Indians in the Army, the Congress demanded that steps should be immediately taken so as to enable the grant of at least 25 per cent. of the Commissions to Indians, to be increased to 50 per cent. within fifteen years.

The Congress decided to send a Deputation to England, and appointed a Committee of selection for the purpose.

It will thus be noticed that the Special Session, which had threatened at one time to create a schism on the question of Reforms in the Congress, passed off successfully. After considerable discussions it came to conclusions which reconciled various conflicting views and commanded the unqualified support of the large majority of Congressmen all over the country. A session of the Muslim League had been held at the same time under the Presidentship of the Raja of Mahmudabad and adopted a resolution on practically the same lines as the congress[20].

The reaction of the Congress resolution on the Moderate leaders is not easy to determine. A section of them probably realized the folly of secession from the Congress, but the party as a whole adhered to its old decision to boycott the Congress. It is difficult to accept the view that the Moderates were forced to take this step. In any case, the fact that the Congress did not reject the Reforms scheme took the ground from under the feet of the secessionists. They met at a Conference in Bombay in November, 1918, to formulate their views on the Montford proposals. There was thus an irrevocable parting of the ways, and the emergence of a new political party called the Liberals.

The secession from the Indian National Congress must have caused a great wrench to many old Moderates like Surendra Nath Banerji who had devoted their lives to the building up of that great national organization. It is only fair to them to believe that they did not take this step light-heartedly or in a fit of momentary impulse ; they must have taken recourse to it after due deliberation, and only yielded to an overpowering sense of public duty. It is not difficult to imagine that after frustration of a lifetime they were overjoyed at the very idea that India was at least being placed on the road to Responsible Government. They put too much value on this, the ripe fruit of their lifelong endeavour, to take any risk whatsoever on the way of its fulfilment. They knew and were too well coached by Montagu to forget, that the bureaucrats in India and the die-hard politicians in Britain were ready to do their utmost to wreck the Scheme, and nothing could save it but a loyal, zealous, and sincere support on the part of the Indians to Montagu's efforts. The attitude of uncompromising hostility to the Scheme shown by some Extremist leaders made it, therefore, specially incumbent upon them to give stead-

fast support to Montagu. This attitude was perhaps strengthened by a sincere belief, at least on the part of a large section of them, that Montagu was genuinely interested in the welfare of India and his attitude to India indicated a real change of heart. The failure to grasp the hand of fellowship extended by him to the Indians would, they thought, be a betrayal of the country, and such an opportunity may not recur in near future.

Such reasonings undoubtely go a long way to explain, though not to excuse, the non-attendance of the Moderates at the Speacial Session of the Congress in 1918. If we remember the adverse comments of some eminent Nationalist leaders on the Montford Report quoted above, the Moderates may be excused for the belief that the Congress would reject the scheme *in toto* They thought, though perhaps not rightly, that as a minority, they would only compromise their position by attending the Congress without being able to influence its decision in any way. The fallacy of such reasoning has been exposed above. Nevertheless, the action of the Moderates in abstaining from the Special Session of the Congress should not be condemned outright, without any reservation, as has generally been done by many of their opponents.

There is, however, no doubt, that the uncompromising attitude of the Moderates, even after the conciliatory gesture of the Congress in its Special Session, deserves unqualified condemnation. Even if the Moderates regarded the resolutions passed by the Congress as inadequate and unsatisfactory, the Congress had surely kept the door open for compromise, and it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the Moderates were guilty of a serious error of judgment in failing to explore the possibilities of presenting a united front by consulting the leaders who had shown a spirit of moderation in the Special Session of the Congress. They perhaps thought that a strong and unanimous resolution in favour of the Reforms Scheme would far more strengthen the hands of Montagu than any compromise to which the Congress is likely to agree, perhaps not without opposition of a considerable minority. It may be that they felt in honour bound to fulfil the undertaking which some of their leaders had given to Montagu to organize a separate party to carry on propaganda in favour of his proposals.[21] These and other reasons may be advanced, but

though they readily explain, they certainly do not justify, the fateful step taken by the Moderates.

It is no doubt ungenerous to assume that the Moderates were led by Montagu to secede from the Congress. But, unfortunately, many facts lend colour to this view. That Montagu regarded such a secession as an essential part of his scheme is proved by his own writings.[22] That at least a powerful section of the Moderates readily fell in with this scheme is also proved by Montagu's Diary, as well as by the fact that *even before* the publication of the Montford Report a new party, the 'National Liberal League' was started in Bengal by the ultra-Moderates who issued a manifesto explaining their general attitude to the Reform proposals.[23] *Two days after the* publication of the Report, Surendra Nath Banerji convened a meeting of the Indian Association, Calcutta, a stronghold of the Moderate party, and the whole-hearted approval of the Report by this body was, of course, a foregone conclusion. Nine Moderate Leaders of Bombay issued a manifesto in favour of the Report, though making suggestions for improvement, specially in the structure of the Central Government. As noted above, even before the meeting of the Special Session of the Congress, held on 29 August, 1918, the Moderates had decided to boycott it, and the newly started Moderate organization in Bengal, the 'National Liberal League', had decided to hold a Conference of the Bengal Moderates on August 30, 1918. Thus a separatist tendency among the Moderates can be traced from the very beginning and may not unreasonably be ascribed, at least to a large degree, to the deliberate policy of Montagu.

There is no doubt that the Bombay Congress, boycotted by the Moderates, marked the final parting of the ways between the Moderates and the Extremists. But it was not due to the differences over Montford Report alone. The two successive Congress Sessions at Lakhnau (1916) and Calcutta (1917) had made it quite plain that the Indian National Congress, under the impact of the Home Rule Movement, had changed, almost overnight, into a stronghold of the Extremists. The Moderates realized that their days were numbered, but before bowing to the inevitable, they made a desperate gamble to win their lost popularity by organizing a new party at official bidding. If the Government of India had not been so reactionary while giving practical effect

to the reforms suggested in the Montford Report, the Moderates would have a chance of regaining some of their lost grounds. But the whittling down of the reforms till they became almost a sham, and the introduction of repressive laws to counterbalance the reforms, gave the final death-blow to the Moderates. The Extremists had left the Congress in 1907 only to return in full force nine years later. But when the Moderates walked out of the Congress in 1918 they walked out of the history of the national struggle for. freedom. It was the end of one era and the beginning of another.

8. The Congress Session at Delhi (December, 1918)

The final secession of the Moderates from the Indian National Congress had a great repercussion on its annual session held at Delhi in December, 1918, under the Presidentship of Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya. The Extremist section, which was kept in check in the Special Session of the Congress at Bombay, evidently in the hope of avoiding a split with the Moderates, now broke all restraint. They became rowdy, and even an old veteran like Srinivasa Sastri, one of the few Moderate leaders who still adhered to the parent organization, was not allowed to deliver his speech without constant interruptions, accompanied by rude remarks and gestures. The resolution passed by the Congress about the Reforms also went much further beyond the one passed in the Special Session in Bombay. It runs as follows :—

"That this Congress reaffirms resolution No. 5, relating to self-government passed at the special session of the Congress held in Bombay, subject to this, that, in view of the expression of opinion in the conutry, since the sitting of the said special session, this Congress is of opinion that so far as the Provinces are concerned, full Responsible Government should be granted at once, and that no part of British India should be excluded from the benefit of the proposed Constitutional Reforms."

Srinivasa Sastri moved by way of amendment to drop all the words beginning with "subject to this" and substitute the following in their place : "except the clause pronouncing the scheme to be disappointing and unsatisfactory, and the clause fixing a period of fifteen years for the completion of Responsible Government for India as a whole."

The amendment puts in a nutshell the whole difference between the Liberals cum Moderates and the Nationalists. No unprejudiced critic will aver it to be of such fundamental importance as made it incumbent upon the former to leave the Congress for ever. The portions of the old and new resolutions which were sought to be omitted, conveyed an expression of opinion, and indicate a difference rather of degree than of character. It cannot be denied that an edge to the opposition to the Moderate leader, Srinivasa Sastri, and his proposal was given by the boycott of the Congress by the Moderates and their alignment with the Government. It is perhaps not unreasonable to hold that the participation of the Moderates in the Congress might have softened its tone and considerably modified its attitude.

This clearly emerges from the debate in the Congress on the amendment moved by Sastri. Mrs. Besant, who had now joined the Moderates, supported Sastri's amendment for omitting immediate grant of Responsible Government to the Provinces by referring to the compromise on this point in the Bombay Congress. C. R. Das replied to it as follows : "One speaker said that it was a compact between Nationalists and Moderates.....If that is so, Mrs. Besant is out of court here, because the Moderates as a party have not joined the Indian National Cogngress, and have therefore broken the compact." Mrs. Besant corrected C. R. Das by saying that she referred to a compromise and not a compact. To this C. R. Das replied : "I entered into that compromise because I hoped that upon the surrender of a point by us the Moderate Party as a whole would join us. The Moderate Party has not joined us".

The Congress resolved to send a Deputation to England consisting of persons who supported the Delhi resolution and not the Bombay compromise. The Congress passed a resolution asking for the recognition of India by the British Parliament and by the Peace Conference as "one of the progressive nations to whom the principle of self-determination should be applied", and as first step, demanded the immediate repeal of all laws, regulations and ordinances restraining the liberty of the people. The Congress also demanded an Act of Parliament establishing at an early date complete Responsible Government in India and according to India the full status of the Dominions. The Congress further

asked for direct representation at the Peace Conference and nominated Tilak, Gandhi and Hasan Imam as its representatives.

According to Chintamani the decision of the Moderates to abstain from the Special Session of the Congress at Bombay in 1918 was not a decision of permanent secession from the Congress, but that events forced on them the latter step. The two events emphasized by him are 'the reiteration (or 'repudiation ?) by the Delhi Congress of the resolution of the special session at Bombay' and the "tearing compaign against the secessionists which was not calculated to facilitate reunion."[24] None of these can be regarded as a sufficient justification. Then he adds: "Non-co-operation became the official policy of the Congress. The parting of the ways was completed" This might have been regarded as an adequate justification but for the fact that the 'parting of the ways' was completed long before the adoption of Non-co-operation by the Congress.

9. Tilak and Home Rule League

It is now necessary to follow the activities of Tilak and the course of the Home Rule Movement which really dominated the entire political situation in India. To counteract the agitation of the reactionary elements in England against the grant of Responsible Government to India, Mrs. Besant's Home Rule League had sent a Deputation to England. Tilak's Home Rule League had grown by leaps and bounds and its membership now exceeded 33,000. At the annual Conference of the League in 1917, a resolution was passed urging the necessity of sending immediately a strong deputation of representative and influential men to England. Accordingly, Mr. Joseph Baptista left for England in July. 1917, and carried on a campaign of lectures throughout the country. Tilak collected money for sending a Home Rule Deputation to England, and one, consisting of Hon'ble Mr. Narasimha Aiyar and four others, sailed in two batches on March 10 and 18, 1918. They safely reached Gibraltar but were forced to disembark there and return to India under the orders of the British War Cabinet. In the meantime Tilak decided to lead in person a deputation to England. The idea was heartily supported all over the country. A Conference of the Indian Home Rule League, held on the eve of his departure, received 1400

telegrams and 617 letters in support of it. It is worthy of note that while the petty cloth merchants of Marwari community presented him with a purse of Rs. 15, 000, 16,000 mill-hands, subhscribing one anna each, contributed one thousand Rupees. The medical profession contributed Rs. 5,000

The Delegation consisting of Tilak, Khaparde, Karandikar, Kelkar and Bipin Chandra Pal left Bombay on March 27, 1918, for Madras en . route to Colombo whence they were to sail for England by the Cape route. The delegates started for the Railway station in decorated motor cars preceded and followed by a long procession. All along the route the roads were packed with crowds of people who showered flowers, and a big gathering at the Victoria Terminus station kept on cheering until the train left. When the deputation arrived at Madras on April 1, 1918, it was received by Mrs. Besant, accompanied by many prominent Congressmen and Home Rulers. A huge procession took the members from the station to Adyar, and thousands, assembled in the streets, gave a hearty ovation to Tilak. The city presented a festive appearance and the delegates were entertained with illumination, gardenn party and dinner. Five hundred orthodox Brahmans performed religious rites in the Parthasarathi temple and took Tilak in procession round the temple with the beating of drums, blowing of conches, and chanting of *mantras*. Tilak received addresses from the Maratha and Andhra communities and the Maratha ladies, and himself addressed a mass meeting of 20,000. Tilak made it clear that the Deputation was going to England, not to appeal to the generosity of the British people, as would have been the case ten years back, but was going to tell the British democracy to save the Empire by trusting India instead of Japan, and granting her Home Rule which would bring forth millions of people to die for the Empire and the Motherland. He appealed to the people to carry on the agitation for *swarajya* with a persistence, the echo of which would be heard in England and would strengthen him in his mission. Tilak and his party also met with a hearty reception from the Indian residents of Colombo. But shortly after their arrival there they were informed that their passports were cancelled and they could not therefore proceed to England.

The cancellation of the passports to the Indian deputations

at Gibraltar (p. 488) and Colombo was due to the following telegram, dated 21 March, sent to the Secretary of State by the Government of India who had issued the passports ; "There appears to be no doubt that these people (of the Deputation) will organise a Home Rule for India campaign in England involving allegations of British misrule causing poverty of India, attacks on Indian Government and officials, assertions that harsh and selfish attitude of the Government has checked loyal co-operation of India in war. It would be mistake to refuse passports from our point of view but some of these people may have to be watched and possibly military or other authorities may regard their presence in England as objectionable or dangerous." Montagu, who was then in Iddia, thus refers to the whole episode in his Diary : "The Tilak incident was very characteristic. Passports were issued to him and his friends, without reference to me. But in issuing them, it seems to me that the Government were clearly right. Tilak had to go home to fight the Chirol case, and to stop his expedition at the time when the papers are full of Lord Sydenham's activities would have been a fatal mistake. But having allowed him to go home, either out of sheer malice or crass stupidity, the Home Department, without reference to the Viceroy, sent home a telegram, containing so black a picture of Tilak's antecedents and probable activities, that I do not wonder the Home Government were nervous. It seems a little strange, however, that they should have cancelled a passport given by a duly authorised authority without consulting him. However, it was done. I drafted for the Viceroy a telegram of protest, which was ultimately sent, with a request for reconsideration. It has failed, the Home Government refuse to let him sail, mainly on the ground, that the General Staff will not have it."

Comment on the extraordinary and irregular activities of the Home Member is superfluous. The cancellation of passports evoked strong indignation and protests from all parts of India.[24a] The British War Cabinet refused permission to Tilak to visit England on the ground that all political controversies should be hushed up while England was engaged in a war of life and death. But, curiously enough, no step was taken against the anti-Indian activities and campaigns of slander carried on by Sydenham and his Indo-British Association which it was the object of Home

Rule Deputations to counteract. In India the bureaucracy pursued Tilak with unremitting hostility. He was not invited to the War Conference summoned by the Viceroy. Montagu disapproved of this step to exclude "that most powerful leader in India at the moment"[25] Gandhi also at first protested and refused to attend the Conference if Tilak, Mrs, Besant and Ali Brothers were not invited ; but, later, was persuaded by the Viceroy to change his view.

Public meetings were held in almost every important town throughout India protesting against the exclusion of prominent Home Rulers, such as Tilak and Mrs. Besant, from the Delhi Conference. It appeared later, from a statement of the Commander-in-Chief, Sir Charles Munro, that their names were included by the Government of India in the list of persons to be invited, but the Governments of Bombay and Madras made their own selection. On April 22, a Manifesto signed by Tilak, Annie Besant, Subrahmania, Kasturiranga Aiyangar, Rangaswami Aiyangar, Patel, Jinnah, Bomanji, Motilal Ghose, C. R. Das, Hasan Imam, Khaparde and many others was sent to the Government of India and England. This Manifesto, in vigorous but restrained language, declared the national view that "if India is to make great sacrifices in the Empire it must be as a partner in the Empire and not a Dependency."[26]

There was a similar War Conference in Bombay on June 10, in which Tilak was invited, perhaps as a result of Gandhi's letter to the Viceroy. Tilak said in that meeting 'that co-operation with the Government necessitated certain things. There could be no Home Defence without Home Rule'.[26a] The Chairman called Tilak to order and said he could not allow any political discussion. When Tilak was twice interrupted and called to order, he left the meeting, followed by his Home Rule League friends. Although Gandhi whole-heartedly participated in the war efforts, and became almost a recruiting agent of the Government without any condition, he condemned the gratuitous insult offered by the Governor of Bombay to the Home Hulers. He, however, impressed upon the people the necessity of helping Britain in her crisis. Tilak, however, spoke in quite a different tone. He delivered a speech in a public meeting at Poona, on

22 June, the spirit of which may be gathered from the following extract :

"The British just want you to supply soldiers whom they want for the war. They tell us 'a calamity is hanging over India'. What is that to us ? Why should we come forward to protect that India in which we have no rights, in which we are treated like slaves ?.....The bureaucracy has overrun the whole nation ; and we are not prepared to become soldiers in order to increase the power of these men. What are we to tell our men ? Join the army to strengthen the *zulum* of these English people ?"

There is no doubt that Tilak voiced the feelings of the nation far more truly than did Gandhi, who was later hailed as the "father of the Nation."[27]

About two months after his return from Colombo, Tilak was granted permission, on 8 June, 1918, to visit England in connection with his defamation case against Sir Valentine Chirol,[28] on condition that he would abstain from political agitation during his stay in England. Tilak was elected President of the Congress, but could not accept the honour as he left for England on 19 September, 1918. On his arrival there Tilak applied for cancellation of the restrictions imposed upon him, and these were removed. So Tilak devoted such time as he could spare from his engagement in the law-suit to political work in England. He first turned his attention to the British Congress Committee in London, which still followed the old Moderate policy without taking note of the great changes that had come over the Congress. Tilak complained to the Committee, but its Chairman postponed consideration of the matter till the arrival of the Congress Deputation. Early in 1919 some Moderate leaders arrived in London and two deputations, of the Home Rule League and the Congress, arrived towards the end of the year. Vithalbhai Patel, the Secretary of the Congress deputation, carried on correspondence with the British Congress Committee which arranged a meeting between the Moderate leaders, including Mrs. Besant who had joined that party, and the Congress deputation. Mrs. Besant, who had so strongly denounced the Reform proposals, now joined Surendra Nath Banerji in declaring that they accepted Dyarchy and regarded the complete Provincial autonomy as undesirable. No agreement was therefore reached, but it was

apparent that the sympathy of both the British Committee and its organ, *India*, was with the Moderates. But after some delay and a great deal of difficulty the Committee was induced to accept the new policy of the Congress as its guide, and gave an assurance that "the policy of *India* will in future definitely and unambiguously conform to that laid down in the resolutions of the Congress from time to time." This happy ending was mainly due to Patel's tact and firmness.

Even while engaged in this discussion with the British Committee, the Congress deputation devoted its attention to the main work, namely, preparation of evidence before the Joint Committee, interviewing the Secretary of State, and educating the British public opinion about the demands of the Delhi Congress. Tilak had already done a lot of propaganda work in meetings and conferences in co-operation with Messrs. Henderson, Wedgewood, Lansbury, Ben Spoor, Hyndman and others. He was invited to speak in several political associations, such as the British and Indian Fabian Society, National Liberal Club, etc. He donated £ 200 to the Labour Party funds and prevailed upon several notable journalists to write in British newspapers about India's claim to Home Rule, Punjab atrocities, Rowlatt Act, etc. Tilak also arranged tea and lunch parties with a view to popularizing Home Rule. Vithalbhai Patel, the Secretary of the Congress deputation, declared that "it was mainly through the efforts of Lokamanya (Tilak), that the Congress deputation was able to secure the support of the whole Labour Party". At the instance of Tilak the Labour leaders agreed to move amendments to the Government of India Bill, though Mrs. Besant tried her best to dissuade them from doing so.

While Tilak was thus busy in England, momentous events occurred in India culminating in Jallianwala Bagh massacre and martial law in the Punjab. It is, at least partially, due to the absence of Tilak from India during this crisis that the political leadership gradually passed into the hands of Gandhi. But at the end of 1918, with which this volume closes, Tilak held the unique position of the uncrowned King of Nationalist India, "the most powerful leader in India at the moment", as Montagu truly declared.[29]

1. Hardinge, 116-7.
2. Ibid, 115.
3. See pp. 419 ff.
4. For the condition of the detenus in general and of Jyotish Chandra Ghosh in particular, of, *MR.* XXIII (1918), 224-7, 336-41, 688.
5. Karmarkar, 263.

5a. See p. 325

6. *Montford Report*, Para 6.

6a. Cf. Vol. I; p. 412.

6b. The *Times*, 2 January, 1907.

6c. Quoted in Parvate, p. 225.

7. *MR*, XXIII. 215.

7a. See above, p. 324.

8. *MR*, XXIII. 214.

8a. See above, p. 183.

9. *MR*, XXIII. 690-92.
10. Ibid, 568-70.
11. Ibid, 559-60.
12. Ibid, 212-3.
13. Montagu, E.S., *An Indian Diary*, p. 288.
14. Ibid, 134.
13. Bagal, p. 215.
16. Athalye, D.V., *Bal Gangadhar Tilak*, 251-2. Cf. also, *Nation*, p. 305.
17. *IAR*, 1919, Part IV, p. 128. Das Gupta, H., *Bharater Jatiya Congress* (in Bengali), II. 156.

17a. See Section 5.

18. *Nation*, Chapter XXX.
19. Das Gupta, H., op. cit., 158.
20. The above account of the Congress session in Bombay is based on the summary in the *History of the Congress* by P. Sitaramay a.
21. Montagu, op. cit., 104, 217. Singh, 309.
22. Montague, op. cit., 82, 104, 134, 217. See above, pp. 475-6.
23. Singh, 359.
24. Chintamani, C.Y., *Indian Politics Since the Mutiny*, 125.

24a. For details cf. Ram Gopal, "*Lokamanya Tilak*, pp. 411-2. Jinnah was one of the leaders who represented the Indian feelings to the British Government and made a vigorous protest to them with a request to rescind the cancellation of Passports.

25. Cf. the passage quoted above in p. 350.
26. *IAR*, 1919, Part IV, pp. 87-8.

26a. Ram Gopal, op. cit. p. 400.

27. Ibid, pp. 400-402.

28. For the Chirol Case in England, cf. Ibid, Chs. LII and LXV.
29. Cf. p. 350 for the position of Tilak *vis a vis* Gandhi as political leader. Also cf. Ram Gopal, op. cit., p. 402.

32V2

INDEX

Abani Mukherjee 409
Abanindra Nath Tagore 137
Abdul Hafiz, 386, 402
Abdul Halim Ghaznavi, 17, 102
Abdul Rasul, 17, 19, 62, 73, 91, 102,
Abdulla Shuhrawardy. 224
Abhinava Bharat, 289 ff.
Abinash Chandra Bhattacharya, 148, 253 ff., 381
Abinash Chandra Chakravarty, 255
Abinash Roy, 283
Abul Kalam Azad, 348
Abul Kasem, 102
Act of 1909, 232, 245
Acton, Lord, 181
Adamson, Mr. H., 110
Adhar Chandra Laskar, 368
Afghanisthan, Mission of 406
Aga Khan, 211
Age of Consent Bill, 34
Aiyar, V. V. S. 296
Ajit Singh, 239 ff, 242 ff, 288 ff
Akshaya Kumar Maitra, 132
Albercht, Herr, 381
Ali Brothers, 348, 493
Aligarh Movement, 210 ff., 232, 311
Alipore Bomb Case, 185, 258 ff., 439
Allen, Mr. 125, 262
Ambika Charan Majumdar, 7, 483
Amir Chand, 289, 295, 459
Amrita Bazar Patrika, 12, 19
Ananda Charlu, p., 83
Ananda Mohan Bose, 22
Anandamath, 149, 158, 255, 285
Anant Lakshman Kanhere, 292
Andhra National Council of Education, 84
Anjuman-E-Urdu, 220
Annie Larsen; S. S. 389 ff.
Ansari, Mian, 416
Anti-Circular Society, 39, 65 69 ff., 93
Anusilan Samiti,—250, 261 ff., 282, 425
Anusilan Samiti, Dacca Br. 265, 277, 424, 447
Arabinda Ghose 59, 76 ff., 98 ff, 127 ff., 139, 147, 151, 166 ff., 171, 175 ff., 185 ff., 191 ff., 196 ff., 199 ff., 259, 262, 294, 310, 359 ff., 435, 440, 447
Archbold. Mr., 215
Arjun Lal Sethi 294
Arsenyer, Mr., 281
Arundel, A.T., 27
Arundale, G.S., 346
Arya Samaj, 239, 241, 288
Asaf Ali, 224
Ashutosh Chaudhury, 72
Asia and Europe, 299
Asquith, 328, 352
Aswini Kumar Datta, 12, 40, 86, 102, 129, 134 ff., 148, 243, 440, 452
Atmaram, 411
Atul Ghosh, 283, 409 ff.
Aurobindo Ghosh—See Arabinda Ghose
Avadh Bihari, 289, 295, 425, 459

Bachcha Singh, 425
Baidyanath Biswas, 283
Bal Gangadhar Tilak, 24, 82 ff, 98, 101, 134 ff, 139 ff, 147, 166 ff, 174, 189, 191, 198 ff, 201, 206 ff, 243, 282, 292, 294, 310, 327, 331 ff, 339 ff, 344 ff, 350, 354, 357 ff., 436, 440 ff, 450, 478 483, 490 ff., 493 ff.,
Bal Mukund 289, 295, 425, 459
Balasore 410, 413
Ballin, Her Albercht 381
Bande Mataram 76, 99, 101, 158, 167, 184 ff., 242, 296, 363 ff., 367, 374, 401
Bandhab Sammilani 264,
Banerji, J. L., 117, 121 ff, 184, 478
Bangadarsan 159
Bangavashi, The 42
Bankimchandra Chatterji 126, 149 ff.
Bankim Chandra Mitra, 285 ff, 425
Bapat, P. N., 290
Baptista, Joseph, 335, 340, 490
Barha, 273 ff, 449
Barhat Keshari Singh, 294 ff.
Barindra Kumar Ghose, 253, 258 ff, 262, 452
Barisal, 41, 48, 50, 86 ff. 103, 133
Barisal Conference, 91 ff, 96, 98, 184
Barisal (Muslim) Educational Conference, 109
Barisal Hitaishi, The, 34
Barkatulla,—See Muhammad Barkatulla
Barneville Mr., 106
Bartaman Rananiti, 254
Basanta Kumar Biswas, 424, 459
Basanta Kumar Chatterji, 444
Bell, Mr. Beatson, 106 ff
Belonia and Udaipur Farms, 268
Benaras Conspiracy Case, 287, 296, 462
Bengal Landholders' Association 7
Bengal Mohammedan Association, 104
Bengal National College, 74, 76, 78
Bengal National Conference (1908), 78
Bengal Provincial Conference, (1906 Barisal), 90 ff, 478
Bengal Technical Institute, 76, 78
Bengalee, The, 6, 17, 109, 332
Benoy Kumar Sarkar, 74
Bepin Chandra Pal—See Bipin Chandra Pal
Bérkman Mr., 398
Berlin Committee, 384, 408
Berliner Tageblatt, 378
Bernardi, Von., 378
Bernstorff, Count., 395, 398
Bertheim, Baron Von., 381
Besant, Annie, 199, 326, 331 ff, 336 ff, 343 ff, 349 ff, 355, 359, 435 ff, 452, 465, 472, 478, 483, 489, 491, 493 ff
Bhagwan Singh, 365, 374, 404
Bhai Bhagwan, 397
Bhai Paramananda, 289
Bhal Chandra Krishna, 175
Bhat, R. D., 291
Bhat, Dr. V. M., 293 ff
Bhattacharya, N. N., 368
Bhawani Mandir, 253, 262
Bhikaji Rustam K. R. Cama, 302 ff, 363 ff, 401
Bholanath Chandra, 35

Bholanath Chatterjee, 364, 409 ff,
Bhupendra Nath Basu, 7 ff, 62, 93, 211, 332, 342, 476, 483
Bhupendra Nath Datta, 147, 253, 379 ff., 381, 383 ff., 440
Bhupesh Chandra Nag, 243
Bibhuti Bhusan Halder, 287, 426
Bijoy Nag, 360
379 ff, 383 ff, 440
Bipin Chandra Pal, 18, 48, 62, 73, 76, 82, 99, 101, 116, 127, 139 ff, 159, 187, 189, 191, 194, 205, 252, 296, 346, 401, 443, 491
Birendra Sarkar, 404
Birendra Nath Chattopadhyaya, 380 ff, 386, 401
Birendra Nath Mukherjee, 382
Bishnu Dutt, 295
Biswanath Pande, 426
Blunt, Mr. W. S., 439, 452
Boehm, Gorge Paul, 391, 398, 400
Bomanji 493
Bopp, Frank, 394
Brahmabandhab Upadhyaya, 82, 99 ff, 116, 124, 191
Brajendra Kishore Roy Chaudhuri, 47, 72, 123
Brajendra Nath Seal, 73
Brincken, Baron Wilhelm Von, 394
British Committee of the All-India Muslim League, 235
British Congress Committee, 355, 494 ff
British Indian Association, 355
Brodrick, Mr.. 5 ff, 27, 115
Bryan, W. J., 373
Buchan, Mr. 217 ff
Budge-Budge, 430 ff
Buribalam (river), 153
Burken, Von, 402
Byomkesh Chakravarty, 73

Cama, Madame—See Bhikhaji Rustam R. K. Cama
Capital, The, 9, 55
Carbonari, 436
Carlyle Circular, 61 ff
Central Committee of the Muslim League, 218
Central Muhammadan Association, 221
Central National Muslims' Association, 218
Chamberlain, Mr. Austen, 464
Champakraman Pillai, 385 ff, 402
Chandernagore, 19, 264, 424
Chandra Kanta, 288
Chandra K. Chakravarty, 391 ff, 394, 396, 400, 404
Chandrika Dutt, Pandit, 83
Chapekar. Brothers, 289
Charu Chandra Mallik, 62
Charu Chandra Roy, 264, 360
Charu Mihir, The, 8
Chatterjee, J. M., 287 ff, 289
Chaudhuri, Mr. J. See Jogesh Chaudhuri
Chelmsford, Lord, 230, 350, 463, 471
Chidambaram Pillai, 296
Chintamani, C. Y., 170, 172, 350, 490
Chirol, Valentine, 122, 225, 436, 492, 494
Chittapriya Ray Chaudhuri, 415
Chittaranjan Das, 73, 251 ff, 489, 493
Chittaranjan Guha (Thakurta), 93, 95

Chunni Lal Saraya, 200
Churchill, Winston, 439
Civil Disobedience Movement, 93, 133, 154
Clemenceau, M., 355
Commonweal The, 336, 338
Comrade, The, 312
Congress (Indian National) Sessions

1905 (Varanasi), 114, 123, 140, 165. 187 ff
1906 (Calcutta), 79, 165, 190 ff, 310, 466
1907 (Surat), 185, 196 ff, 309
1908 (Madras), 246, 309
1909 (Lahore), 246
1914 (Madras), 342
1915 (Bombay), 338, 342, 344
1916 (Lakhnau), 336, 344, 357, 487
1917 (Calcutta), 343, 345, 351, 472 ff., 487
1918 (Bombay), 481 ff., 487
1918 (Delhi), 326, 488 ff., 495
Congress of Socialists (Amsterdam), 297
Congreve, Richard, 300
Cotton, Sir Henry, 5, 139
Crewe, Lord, 28, 247 ff.
Cross, Lord, 219
Curtis, Mr. Lionel, 469 ff.
Curzon, Lord,—3, 4, 25, 103, 113, 115, 210, 470 ff.

Dadabhai Naoroji, 165, 172, 192 ff, 297, 466
Daily Chronicle, The, 137
Daily News (of London), The, 89
Damodar Joshi, 292
Damodar Swarup, 425 ff
Darbhanga, Maharaja of, 205
Darisi Chenchayya, 368
Das, C. R., See Chitta Ranjan Das
Dawn, The, 70
Dawn Society, 18, 69 ff, 157
Dayananda Sarasvati, 35, 239
De Valera, Eammon, 375
Debabrata Basu, 147
Debendra Chandra Chaudhuri, 284
Defence of India Act, 459 ff
Dekkar, Dr. Daus, 383
Delhi Conspiracy Case (1913), 459
Delhi Durbar (1911), 248
Dharap Group, 291
Dharma, The, 359
Dhingra, See Madanlal Dhingra
Dhiren Sarkar, 381, 399
Dilla Singh, 426
Dinabandhu Sen, 12
Dinanath, 289
Dinanath Biswas, 79
Dinshaw Wacha, 483
Duke, Sir William, 469 ff
Durant, Will, 37
Durpal, 414
Dutt, R. C., 59
Dyarchy, 469, 494

Emden, S. S., 318
Emerson, Mr. T., 93 ff
Englishman, The, 4, 9, 13, 17, 53, 467,
Enver Pasha, 383
European Defence Association, 473
Extremist Party, 138 ff, 165 ff, 191 ff, 196 ff, 207, 246, 309 ff, 312, 330 ff., 478, 481

Farid Bey, 364
Federation Hall, 22
Féroze Shah Mehta, See Pheroze Shah Mehta
Fifth Light Infantry, 402 fl
Fraser, Sir A, 25 ff, 271
Free Hindustan, The, 368
Freeman, G. F., 365
Freeman's Journal of Sydney, 298
Fuller, J. Bamfylde, 9, 15, 65 ff, 85 ff, 88, 96, 112, 225, 328, 244, 258

Gackwar of Baroda, 401
Gaelic American, The, 365
Gandhi, 1, 98, 116, 119 ff, 124, 128, 133, 167, 170, 190, 233, 311 ff, 327 ff, 358, 490, 493, 495
George, Lloyd, 324, 328, 439, 467 ff
German Union of Friendly India, 381
Ghadar, Weekly Paper, 369, 371 ff, 422
Ghadar-i-Ganj (booklet), 419, 422
Ghadar Movement, 365 ff, 399
Ghadar Party, 369, 376, 382, 392, 404, 408, 417, 425, 429, 431
Ghalib Pasha, 416
Ghalibnama, 416
Ghose, A. K., 63
Giris Chandra Ghosh, 132
Gokhale, N. S. 292, 294
Gopal, 413
Gopal Hari Deshmukh, 35
Gopal Krishna Gokhale, 28, 115 ff., 119, 123, 141 ff., 170 ff., 187, 190, 194, 199, 203 ff., 233, 247, 292, 311, 331 ff., 460
Griffiths, Sir Percival, 225
Gurdit Singh, Baba, 429 ff
Gurudas Banerji, 73, 123

Habibullah, Amir of Afghanistan 407
Hamilton, Lord, 219
Hardayal, 288 ff, 299, 353, 368 ff, 379, 381, 384 ff, 397, 405
Hardie, Mr. Keir, 49
Hardikar, N. S., 354 ff.
Hardinge, Lord, 28, 247 ff, 289, 325, 459 ff.
Hari Kumar Chakrabarti, 412
Harry. S., (Schooner), 391, 397
Harry & Sons, 409, 412 ff
Hassan Iman, 482, 490, 492
Helfferich, Theodor, 409, 411
Hem Chandra Das, 258, 291, 294
Hemendra Prasad Ghose, 81
Henderson, 495
Hentig, Dr. Von, 406
Heramba Lal Gupta, 389, 391, 395 ff., 404
Hewett, Sir Jhon, 236
Hind Bardaree, 401
Hindi Association (of America), 311
Hindu-Muslim Conference. 311
Hindu-Muslim Pact, 330
Hindusthan Society, 401
Hirendra Nath Datta, 72, 79
Hitabandhu. The, 15
Hitavadi, 8
Hizar, J. Clyde, 389
Hollweg, Bethmann, 406
Home Rule League, 337, 339 ff. 343 ff, 347, 354 ff, 490 ff., 494
Home Rule Delegation, 475
Hopps, John Page,—183
Howard, Ray, 389

Husain Khan, F., 375
Hyndman, 302, 495

Ibbetson, Sir Denzil, 288
Ibrahim Khan, 109
Igel, Von, 391, 396, 399
Illbert Bill, 33, 473
Imperial Council, 211, 329
India House (London), 299, 301, 303
Indian Association, 6, 13, 187, 487
Indian Criminal Law Amendment Act, 459
Indian Daily News, The, 53
Indian Home Rule League, 490
Indian Home Rule Society, 224, 299
Indian Independence Committee, 382, 385 ff., 387
Indian Independence League, 368
Indian Industrial Conference, 59
Indian Musalman Association, 104
Indian National Congress, 5, 24, 59, 77, 78, 119, 138, 148, 165, 221, 256, 297, 309, 314, 327, 331, 336, 352 ff., 466, 475, 479, 485 ff., 494. See also Congress Sessions'
Indian National Society, 369
Indian National Volunteer Corps, 386
Indian Nationalist Party, 397
Indian Patriots' Association, 239
Indian Press Act, 247
Indian Review, The, 311
Indian Revolutionary Party, 399
Indian Sociologist, The, 299 ff., 302, 367
Indian Student (Journal), 401
Indo-American Association, 365
Indo-American Club, 365
Indo-British Association, 492
International Pro-Indian Committee, 386
International Socialist Conference, 384
International Socialist Congress, 302
Islamic Fraternity, The, 364, 374

Jack, Mr., 87 ff
Jadu Gopal Mukherji, 262 ff, 283, 397, 409 ff
Jagaran-o-Bishforan, 275
Jatin Hui, 283
Jatindra Mukherji, 263, 283 383, 409 ff, 411 ff
Jatindra Mohan Tagore, 123
Jatiya Siksha Parisad, see National Council of Education
Jayakar, M. R., 202
Jawala Singh, 366, 388
Jebseon, Fred, 389
Jenkins, Sir Lawrence, 255
Jhang Siyal, 288
Jinnah, M. A., 312, 350, 493
Jitendra Nath Lahiri, 368 ff, 381, 409
Jnanada Govinda Chaudhury, 12
Jodh Singh, 394, 396 ff
Jogendra Chandra Ghosh, 35
Jogesh Chandra Chaudhury, 7, 95, 136
Johore, Sultan of, 403
Jopal, 82
Joshi, Mrs. A. V., 82
Joshi, Samuel Lucas, 365
Jugantar, See Yugantar,
Jyotish Pal, 415
Jyotish Chandra Ghose, 462
Jyotindra Chandra Mukherjee. See Jatindra Mukherjee,

Kaiser, The, 315, 318, 381, 387, 406 ff
Kali Charan Ghose, 275
Kali Prasanna Das Gupta, 66
Kali Prasanna Kavyavisharad ,19, 94
Kanai Lal Datta, 155, 260, 443
Kansiram, 366, 371
Kansiram Joshi, 368
Kaptipada, 413
Karandikar, R. P. 340, 346, 491
Karmayogin, The, 169, 186, 359 ff
Kartar Singh, 425
Karve, 291 ff
Karve Group, 291
Kasturi Ranga Iyengar S., 349, 493
Kedareswar Guha, 382
Kelkar, N. C., 200, 340, 491
Kemp, Mr., 93, 95
Kennedy, Mr., 259
Kersamp, 383
Kesari, 174, 206 ff, 441
Ketkar, Mrs. 82
Khagendra Chandra Das, 368
Khanchand Varma, 380
Khaparde, G. K., 202
Khaparde, G. S., 101, 134, 140, 174 ff, 191, 340, 491, 493
Khare, K. G., 291, 440
Khare Group, 291 ff
Khudiram Bose, 155, 259, 443
Kingsford, Mr., 259, 444
Kolhapur Bomb Case, 292
Komagata Maru, S. S., 429 ff
Korea, S. S., 418
Kraft, Vincent, 383
Kripal Singh, 427
Krishna Varma, 224
Krishna Kumar Mitra, 11, 62 96, 243
Kunja Bihari Bhattacharya, 301

Lahore Conspiracy Case, 387, 421, 428 ff, 462
Lahore Tribunal, First, 419
Lakhi Dhar, 284 ff
Lala Lajpat Sai, 24, 83, 98, 101, 134 140, 177, 187 ff, 191, 197 ff 240 ff, 243, 288, 297, 310, 354 ff, 399, 337, 440, 450
Lala Pindidas, 368
Lal Ishtahar (Red Pamphlet, 104, 108
Lal Mohan Ghosh, 12, 73
Lamington, Lord, 301
Lawrence Gardens, Lahore, 459
Lees, Mr., 94
Lee-Warner, Sir Willian, 301
Liakat Hossain, 17, 69, 102, 126
Liberal, Party, 485
Lilly, Mr. William Samuel, 226
Limaye, Prof., 84
London Daily News, The, 9, 435
London Evening News, The, 55
Lyon, Mr. P. C., 63, 67

Macdonald, Mr. J. Ramsay, 137, 186, 217, 232, 302
Madan Lala Dhingra, 299, 304, 439, 450
Madan Mohan Malaviya, 194, 483, 488
Madan's Talwar, The, 264
Mahadev Hajaram Bodas, 82
Mahendra Pratap, Raja, 406 ff, 416
Mahmudabad, Raja of, 485
Mahmud Hasan, Maulana, 416 ff
Mahratta, The, 340
Majumdar P. C., 255

Makhan Lal Chakravarti, 412
Malvi, Mr., 200 ff
Malaviya, Pandit M., See Madan Mohan Malaviya
Manchester, the Dean of, 467
Manchester Chamber of Commerce, 56, 115
Manchester Guardian, The, 15, 91
Mangal Pande, 426
Manindra Chandra Nandi, 14, 75, 123
Manindra Chaudhuri, 285
Manindra Nath Seth, 462
Manoranjan Sen Gupta, 415
Mansur, Ahmad, 382
Marathe, 346
Martin, C.,—See Narendra Bhattacharya
Marwari Chamber of Commerce, 56
Mata Hari, 387
Maverick, S.S., 389 ff, 409 ff
Mazhar-ul-Huq, 211
Mazzini, 263, 435 ff
Mesurier, Mr. Le, 109
Midnapore District Conference 185, 197
Mihir O Sudhakar, The, 110
Minto, Lord, 27 ff, 85, 95, 111, 141 ff, 204 ff, 211, 213, 223. 228, 238 ff, 241, 243, 244 ff, 311, 482
Minto, Lady, 141, 216
Mirza Abbas, 290 ff
Mitra, P., 251 ff, 262, 447
Model National College, 84
Moderate, Party, 114, 138 ff., 145, ff., 165 ff, 191 ff., 196 ff., 246, 309, 329, 331, 338, 343, 344 ff, 350 459 ff., 464 ff., 472, 475 ff., 479 ff., 486 ff.
Modern Review, 182
Mody, H. P., 199
Mohammad Ismail Chowdhury, 18
Mohammedan Conference (Dacca), 109
Mohammad Noman, 225
Mohammedan Vigilance Association, 103
Mahant of Jodhpur, 295
Mohsin-ul-Mulk, Nawab, 211, 215, 220 ff, 223
Molesworth, Lt. Gen. G. N., 403
Monoranjan Guha Thakurta, 62, 94, 243
Montagu, Mr. E. S., 230, 348 ff, 354, 465 ff, 470, 472, 475 ff, 480, 482, 485 ff, 492, 495
Montagu-Chelmsford Report (Montford Seport), 230 ff, 247, 470, 475 ff, 478, 487
Moonje, B. S., 134, 340
Morley, John, 10, 27 ff, 105, 113, 141 ff, 167, 180, 190, 203 ff, 218, 238, 243 ff, 292, 311, 353, 441, 482
Moreley-Minto Reform, 186, 232, 301, 311, 333
Motilal Ghosh, 73, 93, 493
Motilal Nehru, 200, 339
Motilal Roy, 264, 360
Mudholkar, Mr., 173 ff
Muller, Dr.,381
Muhammad Ali, 211, 216, 224, 312 ff, 350
Muhammad Barkatulla, 364 ff., 383, 386, 402, 406 ff.
Muhammadan Educational Conference, 220
Mujahidins, 415 ff.
Mukti Kon Pathe, 256
Mukunda Das, 131
Munro, Sir Charles, 493
Munshi Ram, 83, 371

Muslim League, 104, 211, 220 ff, 235, 310 ff, 348 ff, 466, 475, 485
Mustafa Kamal, 263

Nagendra Nath Ghose, 75
Nair. Dr., 474
Nair, T. M., 83
Nalini Mukherji, 426
Nandalal Banerji, 444
Nani Gopal Mukherjee, 265
Narasimha Aiyar, 490
Naren Bhattacharji, 409 ff
Naren Chaudhuri, 410
Naren Ghose, 278
Narendra Gosain, 260, 437, 446
Narendra Mohan Ghosh Chaudhuri, 283
Narendra Nath Sen, 14, 97, 125 205
Nasik Conspiracy Case, 290, 304
Nathan, Mr. R., 107, 111
National College, 76 ff, 80, 85
National Council of Education, 62, 69 ff, 78, 85, 187
National Fund Movement, 120
National Liberal Federation, 476
National Liberal League, 487
National Schools, 64, 70, 77
Nawab Khan, 388, 419
Nevinson, H. W., 49, 89 ff., 111 ff.
New India, The, 102, 139, 191, 337, 338, 344, 478
New Rork Times, The, 391, 393, 396
Niedermayer, 406
Nilakanta Brahmachari, 296
Nilratan Sircar, 73
Nimai Chakravarti (alias Tarapada), 413
Nirendra Chandra Das Gupta, 415
Nivedita, Sister, 251, 360, 440
Non-co-operation, 116, 154, 490

O'Donnel, A. J., 9,
O'Donnel, C. J. (M.P.), 30, 112, 114
O'Dwyer, Sir Michael, 288, 326
Obeidullah, Maulavi, 405, 407, 416
Okuma, Count, 392
Oldham, W. B., 25
Olifiers, Z. N. G., 395
Oppenheim, Baron, 381, 399

Pacific Coast Hindusthani Association, 371
Pakistan, 215, 232, 312, 314, 330
Pal, B. C. See Bipin Chandra Pal
Pan-Aryan Association, 265
Pan-Asiatic League, 391, 400
Pandurang Khanakhoje, 368
Panti's Math Meeting, 72
Papen, Capt. Frank Von, 389 396, 402
Paranjpye, S. M., 82
Passive Resistance, 51, 116, 166 ff, 172, 252, 299, 348 ff., 466
Pasupati Nath Bose, 23, 97
Patankar, 293
Patel, Vithalbhai, 493 ff.
Peary Mohan Mukherji, Haja, 123
Pedler, Mr., 62
Penang Times, The, 413
Pentland, Lord, 346, 348
Phadke, 144
Phani Chakravarti, 283, 383, 410
Phelps, Myron, 365
Pheroze Shah Mehta, 196 ff., 200 331, 334

Pingley, see Vishnu Ganesh Pingley
Pioneer, the 9, 435, 437
Piriou, Prof. M. Ernest, 226
Prabhakar Dr., 386
Prabhudayal Marwari, 283 ff
Prafulla Chaki, 258 ff, 444
Prafulla Chandra Roy (P. C. Roy) 440
Pratap Singh, 295, 425
Prativa Dutta, 284
Pratul Ganguly, 425
Preston, Mr., 392
Priyanath, 426
Pro-India, The, 386
Provisional Government of India, 407
Pulin Behari Bose, 397
Pulin Behari Das, 243, 252, 263, 265 ff, 269, 440, 447

Rabindra Nath Tagore, 18, 21, 23 ff, 62 ff, 72 ff, 77, 128, 138, 151, 157, 391, 443, 471
Rai Mangal, 410 ff
Rajani Kanta Sen, 18, 130
Rakhi Bandhan, 21, 40
Ram Chand, 404
Ram Chandra, 374 ff, 380, 388, 390 ff, 417
Ram Chandra Majumdar, 359
Ram Ganga Ram, 82
Ram Singh, 393
Ramananda Chatterji, 181
Ramaswami Aiyar, C. P., 349
Randhir Singh, 369
Rangaswami Aiyangar, 493
Rangpur, 90
Rangpur Zila School, 63 ff
Rao Gopal Singh, 294 ff
Rash Bihari Bose, 263, 289, 295, 424 ff, 427, 459
Rash Bihari Ghosh, 73, 76, 84 123, 198 ff, 251, 348
Red Pamphlet, See Lal Istahar,
Rees, Mr., 441
Reforms of 1892, 172
Reforms of 1909, 246
Reiswitz, Baron Kurt Von, 400
Riots, Coomunal, 235 ff; at Comilla, 104 ff, at Jamalpur, 105 ff
Risley, Sir Herbert, 28, 111
Ronaldshay, Lord, 468
Roosevelt, President, 298
Round Table Group, 469 ff.
Rowlatt, Mr. Justice, 472
Rowlatt Committee; Report of, 255 ff, 268, 275 ff, 280, 404, 408 ff, 430, 472
Roy, D. L., 18, 131, 444

Sachindra Nath Sanyal, 285 ff, 424 ff, 462
Sachindra Prasad Basu, 65, 243
Sachse, S, 395
Sadiq Ali Khan, Nawab, 232
Sailendra Nath Ghose, 397
Saileswar Basu, 413
Salimullah, Nawab of Dacca, 10, 103 ff, 210, 220
Sandhya, The, 8, 42, 101, 116, 122, 242
Sanjivani. The, 8, 11, 96
Sardar Singh Rana, 299, 302, 401
Sarojini Naidu, 377
Sastri, K. D., 354
Satish Chakravarti, 410
Satish Chatterji, 354
Satish Chandra Basu, 251
Satish Chandra Mukherji, 18, 62, 69 ff, 77, 82, 157
Satyagraha, 193
Satyen Basu, 260

Savarkar, See Vinayak Damodar Svarkar
Sayyid Tufail Ahmad, 215, 217
Schack, Von, 389, 394
Schroeder, 400
Se Kunna, 397
Sedition Committee Report See Rowlat Committee
Seely, R. S., 299
Sepoy Mutiny, 133, 303, 453
Shams-ul-Huda, 211
Shamsundar Chakravarti, 243
Sheikh-ul-Islam, 406
Shikhs, 474, 477
Shivaji Festival, 134, 140
Shraddhananda, Swami, 83
Shyam Sundar Basu, 413
Shyamji Krisbnavarma, 224, 294, 299 ff; 303, 363, 370, 401
Silk Letter Conspiracy, 417
Singapore, Mutiny of, 402 ff
Sinha, S. P., 245, 342, 476
Smedley, Agnes, 397 ff
Smith, Dunlop, 215
Snowden, Philip, 384
Society for the Promotion of Technical Education, 76
Sohan Singh Bhakna, 366, 369, 371
Special Tribunals, 461
Srinivasa Sastri, 488
Srinivas R. Wagel, 398
Srish Chandra Ghose, 288
Srish Mitra, 270
Standard, The, 5, 301
Statesman, The, 9, 54, ff., 86 ff., 105, 113
Stevens, Mr. Lyne, 439
Stinton, Mr., 52
Stolypin, M., 435
Stuart, Sir H. A., 110
Subba Rao Pantulu, 332, 334
Subhas Chandra Bose, 402, 454
Subodh Chandra Mallik, 72 ff 243, 252, 447
Subrahmania Aiyar, 83, 120 346. 349, 353 ff
Subrahmania Shiva, 296, 493
Sufi Ambaprasad, 288
Sukthanakr, 381
Sukumar Chatterji, 398
Sun Yat-Sen, 389, 392, 400
Surendra Nath Banerji, 6, 11, 17 ff, 30, 42, 73, 81, 92 ff, 114 ff, 118 ff, 125 127, 140, 147, 187 ff, 193, 196, 200, 205, 247, 258, 332, 338, 440, 478, 180 ff, 485, 487, 494
Suresh Dhar, 284
Suresh Chandra Chakravarty, 360
Suresh Chandra Ghosh, 425
Surya Kanta Acharya, 13, 253, 255
Swaraj, The, 288
Sydenham, Lord, 470 ff, 492
Syed Ahmad, Sir, 104. 219, 224, 232
Syed Ameer Ali, Sir, 235, 311
Syed Hyder Riza, 239

Tarak Nath Das, 368, 382 ff, 392, 397
Tarak Nath Palit, 73, 76
Tardival, Mayor M. Leon, 19
Tauscher, Hans, 389
Tehl Singh, 388
Tej Bahadur Sapru, 339
Terauchi, Count, 391
Thakur of Kuchaman, 295
Theosophical Society, 336, 338
Tilak, See Bal Gangadhar Tilak
Times, The, 15, 57, 218, 303, 466
Tinnevelly Conspiracy case, 297
Tolstoy, 300

Tosa Maru, S. S., 418 ff
Townshend, Meredith, 299
Tribune, The, 288
Trotsky, Leon, 384, 407
Tunney, T. J. 398

Ullashkar Datta, 258
United India Society, 355
Universal Emporium, 412
Upendra Nath Banerjee, 253, 264

Vanchi Aiyar, 296 ff
Vardhaman Jain Vidyalaya, 295
Vasudeo Bhattacharya, 301
Vinayak Damodar Savarkar, 289 ff, 299, 303 ff, 401, 437, 450.
Vinayak Rao Kaple, 425
Violence Department, 445
Vishnu Ganesh Pingley, 425 ff
Vishnu Govind Bijapurkar, 82
Vivekananda, Swami, 126, 148 ff

Wadia, B. P., 346
Wahabis—See Mujahidins
Waqar-ul-Mulk, 220 ff
War Conference, 493
Wasudeo Balwant Phadke, 289
Wesendock, Von, 385
Wilayat Ali, 223
Wilbur, Dr. R. L., 370
Wilson, Wodrow, 328, 353, 397, 469
Wyllie, Curzon, 304, 439

Young India, The, 354
Young Italy League, 435 ff
Young Men's Association, 425
Yugantar, 100 ff, 242, 254, ff, 258, 261, 443
Yugantar Ashram, 369, 371
Yusuf Khan Bahadur, 18

Zaka Ullah, 221, 223
Zemshehina, 282
Ziauddin Ahmad, 223
Zimmerman, 389, 395 ff, 404